

THE
LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1864.

ART. I.—*Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the Operation of the Acts relating to Transportation and Penal Servitude.* Vol. I.—*Report and Appendix.* Vol. II.—*Minutes of Evidence.*

IN response to various complaints which arose last year on the undue leniency of our penal system, and the great increase of crime, Her Majesty was pleased to appoint a Commission to inquire into the operation of certain Acts relating to Transportation and Penal Servitude. The result is to be found in these two Blue Books. We strongly recommend every one who desires to make himself well acquainted with the subject to go through the *Minutes of Evidence* for himself, and then (if he possesses average power of generalisation) he may be as competent as the Commissioners to form a correct opinion, and perhaps more competent to write a good Report.

We must look back a few years to understand by what means we have arrived at our present position. When we recall the state of our prisons, and our bloody criminal code, we are apt to think of former times as harsh and cruel; and it is only on closer inspection that the apparent severity resolves itself into general ignorance and carelessness. The only principle seems to have been, to keep our gaol population within limits by the easiest means. It was easy to clear off the worst cases by hanging, therefore many were hanged; it was easy to draught off the less guilty by transportation, therefore many were transported: but those who have been accustomed

to think only of the severities of past times will be surprised to hear that the number of criminals under short sentences of transportation (passed in the hulks) was kept within limits by a system of commutation and free pardon. 'In the case of a sentence of seven years, it' (the free pardon) 'was granted at the end of about four; in the case of a sentence of fourteen years, it was at the end of six; and in cases of transportation for life, after about eight years,'—and this was 'invariably, except in cases of misconduct, but that very rarely happened.' (*Min. of Ev.*, paragraphs 15, 16.) There does not seem to have been any principle running through the administration of our criminal code:—the easiness of hanging, the easiness of transportation, and the easiness of free pardon, seem to have been at the root equally of its laxity and stringency.

The increasing humanity and justice of the age have abolished the penalty of death except for great crimes; and the unwillingness of our flourishing colonies to be the moral cesspools of England has deprived us of that resource. But while hanging was lessened and transportation lessened, crime still held its sway; so much so, that in 1852 there was in our gaols an accumulation of nine thousand prisoners under sentence of transportation. Then came the Act of 1853, and by it all sentences of transportation for less than fourteen years were abolished, and sentences of penal servitude introduced. But they were introduced on a new principle, and, instead of assigning to the criminal a nominal period, such as seven years, to be commuted into four, they assigned to him a shorter period, which was to have no commutation. But as it was necessary to get rid of the mass of prisoners accumulated under the old laws, the Act also decreed that commutation of sentence under a new form should be extended to them. Instead of free pardons, they were to receive tickets of leave, capable of being revoked for misconduct. Amidst the present outcry against tickets of leave, it is well to notice that, whether bad or good, they were an improvement on the practice that had preceded them. A licence capable of being revoked for misconduct was substituted for a free pardon; though it was granted somewhat sooner than the free pardon had been. A man under a sentence of seven years' transportation had his ticket of leave in three years; under a ten years' sentence, in four years; under a fourteen years' sentence, in six years; under a twenty years' sentence, in eight years; and under sentence for life, in ten years. (*Min.*, 39-44.) This was the theory; but it may well be doubted whether this was the practice. If we look at the small difference between the scale

of remission and that of the former system of free pardon, it becomes evident, that nine thousand prisoners accumulated under the old law could never have been cleared off rapidly under the new. Yet eight thousand prisoners were 'disposed of and released' under the Act of 1853. If so, they must have left prison with long periods of their sentences unexpired; and this indeed is admitted in the *Minutes of Evidence*. (37, 414.) There seems to have been another practical falsehood lurking under the new principle of penal servitude. By the Act of 1853, sentences were made shorter on the very plea that they were not meant to be commuted; but Sir Joshua Jebb tells us distinctly (*Min.*, 563) that a clause in that Act 'empowered the secretary of state to grant remissions to all persons sentenced under it,...but the secretary of state did not think it right to exercise the power:' at least, not till 1859 or 1860, when remission, having been recognised in the sentences passed under the Act of 1857, was also extended in some degree to those sentenced under the Act of 1853. (*Min.*, 93-101.)

Thus the Act of 1853 made two openings for grievous laxity in practice. It allowed such extensive remission of sentences that 8,000 prisoners could be 'disposed of' under its provisions; and it virtually introduced shorter sentences by pretending to abolish commutation while it gave a secret power to commute. Had the Legislature intended to coax a system of lightened penalties from a reluctant nation, they could scarcely have adopted a better mode. To shorten sentences on the ground that they were to be carried out in full, and then to bestow on the secretary of state power to remit them, was the very best means to accustom judges and criminals to shortened sentences, while it prepared the way for a wider system of remission. And thus it came to pass that when by the Act of 1857 statute law formally declared that sentences of penal servitude should be lengthened to the former periods of transportation, that a scale of remission might be applied to them; actual law, that is, law which springs from the bent and bias of its administrators, left the letter of the statute behind: the fact being, that 'the sentences under the Act of 1857 have been extremely short in comparison with those which were passed before;' (*Min.*, 113, 1593;) nay, shorter than ever within the last two years. (*Min.*, 217.)

The Act of 1857 has left us in this position. Transportation as a sentence is wholly abolished, though many under the old sentences are sent every year to Western Australia. Sentences of penal servitude are nominally though not actually lengthened

to the former period of transportation; and a system of remission, to be won by the good conduct of the prisoner, has been formally adopted as the law of the realm. Finally, a short sentence of three years' penal servitude has been introduced as a substitute for ordinary imprisonment. Thus penal servitude has largely taken the place of hanging, of transportation, and, in some measure, of imprisonment.

And what is our English penal servitude?

There are various receiving prisons in England; one at Wakefield, one at Leicester; but the chief ones are Pentonville and Millbank, the latter of which receives about three fourths of all who are sentenced to penal servitude. From these, after a period of solitary confinement, male convicts are draughted to the Public Works' prisons, Chatham, Portland, and Portsmouth. The ailing are sent to Dartmoor, the sick to Woking. Females are received at Millbank, and then passed on to Brixton, and finally to the refuge at Fulham. Juveniles go to Parkhurst in the Isle of Wight. In all these prisons much the same system prevails, and differences in detail are scarcely worth notice.

Every sentence of penal servitude begins with a period of solitary confinement. At first this was fixed at eighteen months; but this, being found to be rather too long for health, was cut down to twelve, and afterwards to nine. Every convict is now said to have nine months of solitary confinement; only it is not solitary confinement, and it is not nine months!—it is quite as often eight, seven, or six. (*App. No. 7, A.*) And during this period the convicts are taught trades which require 'the attendance of the trades' warders to have constant intercourse with them.' (*Min.*, 3161.) Moreover, at Millbank the former physician, Dr. Baly, objected to the close confinement, and insisted on the inner doors of the cells being opened at the end of two months, a practice which 'has continued ever since,' and which allows of intercourse between the prisoners through the external grating.

This is our penal solitary confinement!

After this, some of the best-conducted prisoners, under short sentences, are placed on the household staff as cooks, bakers, &c., whereupon they receive a blue dress, with more liberty and extra privileges. Others are taught profitable trades; but the largest number are employed in gangs on the public works. We might suppose that the labour of penal servitude would itself be penal; but it does not seem so. The blue-dress prisoners are little less than domestic servants; the Public Works' convicts have lighter labour and shorter hours than free men. The engineers, Mr. Evans and Mr. Macdonald, give explicit

evidence on this point. In various rough work demanding force without skill the value of convicts as compared with free labourers stands sometimes as 9 to 7, sometimes as 3 to 2, and, where any skill is wanted, sometimes as 4 to 1. (*Min.*, 5871, 73, 80.) But, adds Mr. Macdonald, in making this comparison, 'I have taken them all on the supposition that they work the same number of hours.' But the free labourer works for 10 hours in summer; the convict $7\frac{1}{2}$ or 8, and in winter only $5\frac{1}{2}$ or 6. (*Min.*, 5899, 6084.) Captain Powell says fearlessly they work for nine hours in summer; but the engineers subtract half a day's schooling, which the men regard as a half-holiday, and two hours on Saturday afternoon. Even this labour is lightened by stress of weather: it is troublesome to dry 1,500 wet jackets and trowsers, yet if they are not dried many of the men will be in the infirmary. 'It is therefore an object to take them under shelter for a time during a storm;' and as there is no means of providing hard work in case of bad weather, the warders have to make all sorts of shifts to keep them employed at light labour. (*Min.*, 717-20, 6090.) Captain Powell ventures to say, there are not three days a year on which they do not go to work:—he does not say how often in this rainy climate they are marched for shelter under sheds, and kept there in close association for hours, breaking stones or doing nothing while the rain lasts. (*Min.*, 1165-9.)

This is our penal labour. Apparently it is not so hard as to interfere with the rule that the diet of penal servitude should itself be penal. What are the facts of the case? At Millbank the lowest diet is—

'at breakfast eight ounces of bread, three quarters of a pint of cocoa. For dinner five ounces of meat after boiling, one pound of potatoes, six ounces of bread, and a quarter of a pint of soup. For supper eight ounces of bread, and one pint of oatmeal gruel.' (*Min.*, 2030-4.)

This is almost the lowest scale of prison diet. Pentonville has two ounces less daily, but the Public Works' prisons are considerably higher. We subjoin the following tables taken from Mr. Harries' letter. (*App. No. 21.*)

	PENTONVILLE.		MILLBANK.		PORTLAND.		PORTSMOUTH.			CHATHAM.		
	Ordinary Diet.	Increased Diet.	First & Second Stages.	Third Stage.	Fourth Stage.	Ordinary Diet.	Third Stage.	Fourth Stage.	Ordinary Diet.	Third Stage.	Fourth Stage.	
Amount of Diet weekly.	oz.	oz.	oz.	oz.	oz.	oz.	oz.	oz.	oz.	oz.	oz.	
	325 $\frac{3}{4}$	339 $\frac{1}{2}$	364 $\frac{3}{4}$	403 $\frac{1}{2}$	391 $\frac{3}{4}$	393 $\frac{3}{4}$	403 $\frac{1}{4}$	373 $\frac{3}{4}$	385	393		

Let us compare this prison diet with that of other classes of the community, remembering Sir George Grey's special injunction that convicts 'are not to be in a better position with regard to diet than ordinary free labourers.'

	oz.
Able-bodied man in Workhouse	243 $\frac{3}{4}$
" Lunatic Asylum.....	363 $\frac{1}{2}$
Soldier	337
Sailor	329 $\frac{1}{4}$
Compositor	245 $\frac{1}{4}$
Working coachmaker	337
Agricultural labourer, single man	315
" man, wife, and 2 children ...	745 $\frac{1}{2}$
" man, wife, and 3 children ...	853

Refractory prisoners have a special diet called 'penal' *par excellence*. For breakfast they have 10oz. of oatmeal, with 10oz. of milk, which makes 'a large and satisfying mess;' for supper, 12oz. of bread by itself; and for dinner, 10oz. of Indian corn, with 20oz. of milk made into a very good pudding, and 8oz. of potatoes. The Indian corn 'makes up into a very nice mess, and the prisoners like it very much.' (*Min.*, 3058-69.) If such is the diet of our prisons, we need not be surprised to hear from Mr. John Evans of the 'robust and well-fed appearance' of the convicts at Chatham, or to be told by Sir Richard Mayne that one great difficulty in identifying released convicts is, that 'after three years or more of penal servitude, a man generally comes out looking fatter, and it is then difficult to recognise him.' (*Min.*, 1559.)

In penal servitude we should expect to find penal restraints, especially restraints on association with each other, with the free population around them, and, above all, with their former depraved companions. But on the public works talking is openly permitted among the convicts; and with one warder to a gang of ten, twelve, or even eighteen men, there can be no practical restraint on their communications. (*Min.*, 888.) They are also brought into contact with free labourers, and through them contrive to keep up intercourse with the outer world; (*Min.*, 1207, 5990-3, 6095-6;) and at certain fixed times, (subject to supervision,) they are allowed to see or correspond with any one whom they please.

In penal servitude we might expect that men would have only the rights of criminals, and be liable to summary measures and prompt punishment for misconduct. On the contrary, many of our prison rules seem invented to subject warders,

doctors, and governors, to their prisoners' caprice. In Chatham prison there is a notice hung up in each cell to inform the prisoners that they have a right to have their dinners weighed in their presence; and, accordingly, there is not a day in which three or four will not make this troublesome demand. (*Min.*, 1076-81.) If they get violent and tear up their blankets, new ones are immediately given them; nor can they be allowed to suffer the effects of their own misconduct, for the medical man 'is bound to do all he can to prevent a prisoner from hurting himself.' (*Min.*, 3121.) If they 'don't like the warder, they will report him and complain that he behaves harshly and overworks them; and the warder gets fined probably 2s. 6d. for over-working the men.' (*Min.*, 5949.)

The governor's power to punish is limited to three days' bread and water, with confinement in a dark cell; but every serious offence is referred to the director, whose periodical visits must often weaken the effect of punishment by a fortnight's delay. He can give a sentence of bread and water, with confinement in a dark cell, for twenty-eight days: he *can* give it, but there is no need to add, that he never does give such a sentence as this. He can, moreover, flog; but he is not permitted to flog *and* give bread and water; (*Min.*, 4069;) and if he flogs, he is limited to two dozen lashes with so light a cat that 'different governors have begged that it might not be used, so that it should not get abroad among the convicts that it was so slight a punishment.' (*Min.*, 4053-8.)

Such are our penal rights and restraints!

We must next notice that part of our prison discipline which is avowedly not penal, but which has been added as a reformatory element, in order to give the convicts something to lose and to win. By daily industry and good conduct they win a trifling gratuity, which is credited to them, and they also are marked G. and V. G. (Good and Very Good) in the warders' books. A sufficient number of these marks entitles them to a partial remission of their sentence, amounting to a sixth of the whole, and for this period they are released under tickets of leave. This gives them something to win; whilst the withdrawal of the gratuity, or of so many days of remission, assists penal discipline by giving them something to lose. The following is the scale of gratuity attainable under a sentence of four years' penal servitude, according to the English and Irish systems (*Appendix No. 10, AA*):—

ENGLAND.

	£	s.	d.
26 weeks' solitary confinement	0	0	0
13 " " at 8d.	0	8	8
65 " 1st stage public works at 15d. ...	4	1	3
52 " 2nd " 19d. ...	4	2	4
13 " 3rd " 23d. ...	1	4	11
39 " remitted	0	0	0
208	9	17	2

IRELAND.

	£	s.	d.
35 weeks' separate confinement	0	0	0
9 " 3rd class public works at 1d.	0	0	9
26 " 2nd " 2d.	0	4	4
26 " 1st " first part.....3d.	0	6	6
26 " " second part.....4d.	0	8	8
26 " advanced class9d.	0	19	6
21 " intermediate prison ...2s. 6d.	2	12	6
39 " remitted	0	0	0
208	4	12	3

We may sum up the items of our prison discipline thus:—The convicts have cheerful cells, well ventilated, lighted, and warmed; and (in advanced stages) supplied with books from the prison library. Their labour is light, their food is abundant, they are guarded from wet and from cold. They have excellent medical attendance and care:—if they have indigestion, they are put on rice pudding for a few days; (*Min.*, 2974;) if they are in the infirmary, almost any article of diet which the doctor may order is at their service. (*Min.*, 2998.)* They have means of communication with each other, and with their friends outside. They are gently admonished for light offences, and lightly punished for serious ones. They pass onward from one stage to another, encouraged and cheered by improved diet and higher gratuities. They win their period of remission easily:—about half of them win the whole of it, and not a fortieth part lose it altogether. (*Min.*, 335-7.) They win their gratuities easily:—they can almost calculate on £2 a year; and if they are great criminals, and have to stay long in prison, they walk out with a sum at command which a poor honest man might envy. This is the system which has grown

* It is told of Dr. Baly, that he once ordered grapes for a female convict, when grapes were worth almost their weight in gold.—*Female Life in Prison*.

up under the fostering care of secretaries of state ; this is our English penal servitude.

If punishment is to be efficacious, it must be righteous in its principles, and deterrent in its effects :—in fact, the two things are one ; for unrighteous punishment *cannot* answer in the long run. If it be unrighteous on the side of severity, it defeats itself, either by becoming a dead letter, or by provoking a reaction towards the contrary extreme ; and if it be unrighteous on the side of lenity, it defeats itself by ceasing to be efficient punishment. We do not therefore ask first whether our penal discipline is deterrent, but whether it is righteous. Is it righteous, that is, right-wise, that those whom we punish for their crimes should be better fed, better clothed, better lodged, better guarded against ill-health and ill-usage, than those thousands of their fellow-countrymen whose poverty is their only crime ? This is not righteous : rather it is flagrantly unrighteous ; and being so, we are prepared to find it unsuccessful also ; as little deterrent in its results as it is penal in its infliction. In the *Minutes of Evidence*, witness after witness testifies to the easy and comfortable lives of our prisoners ; to the carelessness with which our criminal population regard these short sentences and light penalties ; and (as far as the police reports of London can prove it) to the great increase of crime.

An unrighteous system can never have been sanctioned by a whole nation except from a low sense of righteousness in the nation ; and this, we apprehend, is the case in England at present. Our sense of right in the encouragement of right-doing has sensibly advanced in the last fifty years, while our sense of right in the punishment of wrong-doing has retrograded : indeed, the one has encroached so far on the other that we are ready to encourage wrong-doers to return to the right by every means but that of punishing the wrong. This low sense of the fitness and rightness of just punishment shows itself in many forms : sometimes in that slovenliness of legislative or judicial action which only seeks the easiest way out of a difficulty ; sometimes in the stinginess which would prompt the richest of modern nations to forego penal for economic considerations ; but chiefly in a false philanthropy, which, wholly ignoring the righteousness of punishment as punishment, aims *first* at reformation.

To come to details. What slovenliness has been manifested in the framing of our criminal laws, and in the wide margin allowed for variety of sentence for the same crime ! Stealing from the person is an indictable offence, punishable with a long

sentence of penal servitude; yet it may be dealt with summarily under the Criminal Justice Act, with the award of six months' imprisonment with hard labour. Let us hear Sir Richard Mayne on this point:—

“The administration of the law with regard to the widely varying degree of punishment at the present day, is a scandal. Some of the judges, I think, pass sentences of eighteen months for an offence that another judge would pass a sentence of five years or more of penal servitude.”

“The law gives them almost unlimited discretion whether they will pass a very long sentence of penal servitude, or a very short sentence of imprisonment?” “Yes.”

“You are of opinion that that latitude is unwisely large?” “Yes.”

“Does it not make it perfectly uncertain and a species of lottery?” “Yes, the police consider it so; they often report to me, with regard to a case, So and so will be tried before such a judge, and he will get a very light punishment.”

.....“I am sure that the widely varying sentences have a very bad effect at the present time.”—*Min.*, 1659-64.

But it is not only to judges and magistrates that our slovenly laws commit the powers that ought only to belong to law. The secretary of state, and, under him, Sir Joshua Jebb, possess a power to make and break prison rules which may well astound Englishmen, who are accustomed to think that rules should not be made apart from law, and when made by law should not be broken. We have already noticed that the Act of 1853 committed to the secretary of state the power to decide whether men should or should not receive remission under that Act. In 1861 Sir George Grey (not the law of the realm) determined that the usual scale of remission should not apply to men under ticket-of-leave, in case of re-conviction; and in 1862 the same omnipotent authority decided that no such person, if re-convicted, should receive a second ticket-of-leave. (*Min.*, 78.) Sir James Graham fixed eighteen months as the *maximum* of separate confinement; Lord Palmerston finally reduced it to nine. Regulations of diet, regulations of punishment, in short, ‘all those details upon which the whole system turns, are under the supervision, and subject to the regulations,’ of Sir Joshua Jebb, ‘as approved by the secretary of state.’ (*Min.*, 358-9.) And so far has this been carried, that the conditions endorsed on tickets-of-leave, and the resolutions of the Committee of the House of Commons to enforce those conditions, have been by subsequent secretaries of state ‘systematically disregarded.’

Thus then, to separate judges, separate magistrates, separate

secretaries of state,—unconnected by any fixed maxims or principles, subject to their own pet notions and fancies,—have our slovenly laws committed the stability and consistency of law.

But it is not only the uncertainty but the inefficiency of sentences which acts so injuriously on our criminal population; and here individual magistrates and judges are to blame. It must be a great temptation to deal summarily with a case, and send a pickpocket to prison for three months, instead of going through the delay, trouble, and expense of a trial which may end in three years' penal servitude. And as long as magistrates are swayed rather by considerations of delay, trouble, and expense, than by an honest desire to deal righteously with the criminal and with society, we must expect such things to be: we must expect to find men re-convicted nine times over, who have never had a more serious punishment than three months' imprisonment. But such things are not only, as Sir Richard Mayne says, 'a great reproach to the state of the law,' but to its administrators also. The short sentences pronounced by our judges are even more without excuse; for in such cases the delay and uncertainty of a trial have been undergone, and nothing remains to be won by misplaced lenity. It seems like a fatuity, a moral blindness in our judges,—the men whom we have made guardians of the sanctity of law,—that they should be the authors of those brief periods of punishment which experienced criminals scoff at, and experienced officials deplore.

If we turn to the prison life to which these short sentences are the introduction, and object to the various alleviations and privileges which so much deprive it of its penal character and deterrent effects, we are met by considerations of economy on one hand and philanthropy on the other. For example, in the Public Works' prisons the majority of the convicts are employed as excavators, &c., with a diet proportioned to their work; but many of them are taught trades of a lighter description, less burdensome to the criminals, and more profitable to the government.

"Men are, I presume, selected to work as cooks, or tailors, and shoemakers, with reference to their fitness for those occupations, and not with reference to the crimes they have committed?" "Yes, they are selected as to their capacity, and also their good conduct: a badly-conducted man is not allowed to go into the trades' parties at all, because they are employed with tools, and therefore it is not desirable."

"I understand you to mean, a man who has behaved ill after he comes under your care, not having reference to the conduct or

the crime of that man before he came to the prison, nor reference to the period since he has been undergoing his sentence?" "Yes."

"But I presume that a man who, from his personal fitness, may be selected to work at a trade of that kind is, in point of fact, much better off than a man who does the ordinary public work in gangs?" "It is preferred; they are volunteers."

"It becomes a boon to men without being so intended?" "Yes, it does become a boon; but, at the same time, it is very profitable to the Admiralty.".....

"Is the diet of what you call the tradesmen the same as what you call the excavators?" "Precisely."

"Do you consider that that is a reasonable arrangement?" "I do not think you could alter it with advantage; I think it would work very badly if you attempted it; the tradesmen's labour is of more value, and very possibly you would get no men to act as tradesmen if you diminished their diet."

"Looking at the primary object of convict prisons, the punishment of offenders, and by that means the prevention of crime, is it not reasonable that whenever it is practicable greater punishment should be inflicted when they are [?] it is] not injurious to the health of the men?" "But you are desirous, are you not, of making convict prisons as nearly self-supporting as possible, as well as penal?".....

"I presume it is economical, with regard to the cost of the prison to the public, so to employ the convicts?" "Yes."

"Is it equally desirable with reference to the penal consequences of crime that a man who by the accident of early training is a tailor or shoemaker should derive a benefit from it irrespective of the crime he has committed?" "No; but how are we to keep the prison clothing in repair? It would be an enormous expense to the public if we never could repair the clothes or the boots and shoes."

"That, of course, must be paid for; but looking to the interests of the public in checking crime, is it desirable, in your opinion, having had great experience, that, irrespective of the crime a man has previously committed, he should be put upon light labour of that sort with all the comforts of a warm cell rather than the hard labour which other convicts are undergoing?" "No, I do not think it is."—*Min. of Ev.*, 1262-5, 1336-9, 4237-9.

Again, with respect to the blue-dress prisoners at Millbank, it is said to be

'convenient and economical that certain duties should be performed by prisoners who have gone through their separate confinement in Millbank, but are subsequently detained as bakers, in the cook-house, in the store-houses, and to go on messages. They are not under the same discipline as the ordinary prisoners, and they receive a better diet.

"Instead of doing hard work, they are employed about the prison?" "Yes, for convenience. When first I went to Millbank prison, prisoners were not so employed; but it was thought that it

would be economical to employ prisoners in that way, instead of employing servants who had been in the habit of doing those duties.".....

"Are you aware, or not, that that practice was a good deal objected to by the prison inspectors, in various county prisons in England?" "I know that it was a matter of discussion between them when I was inspector of prisons; and I formed the opinion that it was not desirable that those offices should be performed by prisoners: but it was urged upon me that there would be such a saving of expense, in the county and borough prisons, that it was desirable to employ the prisoners on grounds of economy."—*Minutes*, 2011-2, 2219.

In these cases we see how far economy has dispensed with penal considerations. It cannot be very deterrent to a criminal to know that if he is a handy fellow, his three years' penal servitude may consist of seven months' separate confinement, and about two years' employment as cook or baker, with light discipline and full diet; after which he will be restored to society with a nice little gratuity in his pocket.

But it is not economy that we have to thank chiefly for the mildness of our prison discipline; no, nor philanthropy in the true sense of the word; rather a false phantom which borrows its name, but which is in fact little more than a pet system of the Criminal Department of the Home Office. But let us do our authorities justice:—this pet system is in their eyes a representative of moral and industrial training. They are satisfied that such and such regulations 'work well' in maintaining the discipline and good order of our gaols; and they have persuaded themselves that the good order of our criminals in gaol is a sort of guarantee of their good conduct when they return to society: hence they assume, that to promote the good order of our gaols is to promote the reformation of our criminals,—and they act on this assumption. Calmly, fearlessly, openly, they ignore penal and deterrent considerations for 'objects of much greater importance,' and shape their rules accordingly. The Commissioners asked Sir Joshua Jebb if certain measures had practically a deterrent effect, and he answered calmly,—

'Probably not. Convicts and the criminal population are aware that they are considerably treated, and they must be. There are only two ways of dealing with men—either to drive or lead them. If you drive them, the public suffer from the effects of the demoralisation; and if you lead them, they gain by a large proportion being reformed.'—*Minutes*, 818.

This is Sir Joshua Jebb's system: he leads the men by privi-

leges and gratuities and comforts ; and when he has pushed a large number of them through the stages of his model prisons with V. G. marked opposite their names day by day, and with their remission worked out by good conduct, he assumes them to be reformed members of society, and declares that his system works well.

The good order that springs up naturally in free communities is the best possible test of good principles ; but the good order of coerced communities (especially if it be purchased by compromises and bribes) is a miserable and mischievous delusion. Sir Joshua Jebb says he 'endeavours to enlist the men's own interests at all times ;' but it is one thing to have interests enlisted to reform, and another to have them enlisted only to seem reformed. This system is hollow from beginning to end. A convict goes into prison under a false sentence, works out his time under a series of false assumptions, and comes out in a false position. First as to his sentence :—We are by this time aware that a portion of every sentence is (with average good conduct) remitted under ticket-of-leave ; but are we aware of the extent to which that remission may be carried ? The rule is, that in short sentences a sixth part may be remitted ; but when the sentence is for fifteen years and upwards, the remission amounts to a third. But who will certify that that rule will be kept, when, at this very time, convicts whose sentences date earlier than 1853 are receiving remission at the old rate—that is, in eight years under a sentence of twenty, and in twelve years under a sentence for life ? (*Min.*, 467, 478.) Who will certify it, when, under the present scale of remission, we find that since 1857 three hundred and ninety-three men have been released under tickets-of-leave *before* the earliest prescribed period, and eighty discharged on pardon ? (*App. No. 3, Q.*) With different rates of remission working side by side, and with an irresponsible secretary of state to modify all such rules at his pleasure, these long sentences solemnly pronounced by the judge on the bench bear on their face an uncertainty that amounts to falsehood.

The very fact of remission is itself an inconsistency in penal servitude. No principle of law allows to good conduct a redeeming power over past transgression ; but on moral grounds this inconsistency may be tolerated, since morality declares that amendment *may* redeem the sins of the past. But at all events the amendment should be real. We are not to assume that good order under coercion means inward reformation. A convict may work well, and be civil and respectful, and receive a daily mark of V. G., without one

thought of repentance, or one resolve of amendment. More than this, he may receive nearly his full remission without being uniformly well conducted, and without working well; for, in the first place, his gaolers are so willing to give him credit for being reformed, that even if he misconducts himself in an earlier stage of his prison career, they are ready, on his subsequent good conduct, to strike off three-fourths of that portion of remission which his misconduct had lost; and, in the second place, they are so willing to give him credit for being industrious, that they make it the interest of the warders to report well of the convicts by paying them gratuities proportioned to the general efficiency of their men. Under such circumstances we can well believe Mr. Measor's statement that idleness or misconduct in labour 'must obtrude itself very forcibly' to affect the prisoner's claim on remission. (*Min.*, 5668-70.) With all these aids to seem good, if not to be good, we cannot wonder that fully one half of these depraved and wicked men obtain the full period of remission, and that only a small fraction lose it altogether.

Finally, they come out of prison in a false position, assumed to be hopeful, if not positively reformed, characters; and so far has this been carried, that wherever the police may find ticket-of-leave men, even if it be in the haunts of thieves and prostitutes, they are instructed 'not to notice them, lest it might make them known, and interfere with their getting employment.' (*Min.*, 1624-26.) Even Sir Richard Mayne admits himself to have been blinded by the false assumptions of our penal system. 'I do not think,' he says, 'that I was aware that the ticket-of-leave was given as a matter of course. I looked upon it then that the ticket-of-leave was rather a certificate of a reformed man.' (*Min.*, 1822.)

Captain Powell says he cannot see how the present system is to be made more penal: to us it appears that the possible alterations are so many and so great as to require to be carried out in gradual measures through a long lapse of years. And because such slow changes can only be insured by the consistent convictions of a whole people, the first step in the path of improvement is to diffuse among our uncriminal population a higher sense of the righteousness of punishment. We do not send men to prison to fatten them into efficient quarrymen, no, nor even to reform and teach them to do better; we send them there, first and foremost, to suffer for their misdeeds. It is fitting that the wrong-doer should suffer, even to his own injury. When God chastises man by grief, or sickness, or anxiety, injury is done to body and mind; but, in the higher

objects to be attained, discipline brings its compensation. So when man punishes man, it is blind foolishness to attempt to shield the sufferer from injury; for if he be in no respect injured, his sufferings exist but in name. He *ought* to come out of prison somewhat worn in body and mind:—if he come out fat and flourishing, we may be sure he has *not* been righteously punished. Poor men are worn by want and work, rich men by care and worry;—all classes bear the penal sentences of our common life; and are our criminals to be shielded from them? Let us put that spurious humanity aside. In the community as in the individual the objects to be attained by penal discipline are higher than the mere escape from suffering and injury: and though mortal eyes cannot always discern those objects, though we cannot see clearly how far penal laws are practically deterrent, yet if we are sure that, apart from effects, the righteousness of punishment is a principle laid down by God Himself, we shall be satisfied to punish righteously, and leave the results with Him.

We should not then be tempted for a moment to put such a low motive as economy above penal considerations. It is disgraceful to the richest nation in the world to stamp inconsistency on her laws for the sake of saving money. In truth, we believe there would be little thought of saving it, if we could see our way to satisfactory results. But amidst the weakness and unrighteousness of our penal system, it is something at least to save the cost and make it self-supporting.

We want a Royal Commission to report on our various criminal laws, and their still more varied administration. At present, punishment by penal servitude, punishment by imprisonment, and summary punishment under the Criminal Justice Act, are all working separately and inconsistently, and helping to defeat the ends of justice. The Criminal Justice Act was meant to deal with small offences, for which six months' hard labour in prison might be sufficient punishment; but constant re-convictions (such as fifteen in nine years, *Min.*, 1766-7) imply a habit of offending which is anything but a small offence, and which should therefore be withdrawn from the jurisdiction of that Act. Again, it was evidently intended that imprisonment for eighteen months or two years should apply to smaller offences, and three or four years' penal servitude to more serious ones. But our penal servitude is so much lighter than our county imprisonments, that criminals actually prefer a sentence of three or four years' penal servitude (reducible by remission to two and a half and three and a quarter) to eighteen months' or two years' imprisonment. (*Min.*, 824.) Thus, under

our unequal and unrighteous laws the greater criminal has the lighter punishment.

We need also that the law itself should more clearly define crimes and their punishment, and leave less scope to the discretion of individual magistrates and judges. This is Sir Richard Mayne's opinion:—

“To take, as an example, two classes of cases, burglary and robbery, I think that a more accurate definition of those crimes is necessary, so as to make one class of them where there is actual violence, or actual breaking into a house with crowbars and centrebits, and that there should be a specific punishment affixed, and the shortest limit affixed for each of those offences.

“You think that the discretion of the judges should be limited by law, and that instead of giving them a large discretion there should be a sentence passed of not less than a certain number of years, without the alternative of imprisonment?” “Yes, I think so. In cases of imprisonment the *minimum* should be laid down by law.”—*Minutes*, 1663-4.

With regard to this *minimum*, we must observe that all the witnesses agree in deprecating the short sentences imposed at present. Sir Joshua Jebb ‘objects to them altogether,’ and would adopt ‘a *minimum* of perhaps five years.’ (*Min.*, 331, 878.) Sir Walter Crofton objects, and would gladly make the *minimum* seven years. (*Min.*, 3362, 3574.) Captain Whitty protests against them; (*Min.*, 3799, 3803;) and so does Sir Richard Mayne: ‘I do not believe,’ he says, ‘that a sentence of three years (with the probability of a considerable remission) affects either those persons who have suffered it, or those who might be deterred by a severe sentence.’ (*Min.*, 1595.) Mr. Organ, the energetic and hopeful lecturer of the Irish Convict Department, says, ‘I think short sentences, especially in the case of habitual thieves, a waste of human suffering, and a squandering of the public money. Four out of six of those who relapse are short-sentenced men.’ (*Min.*, 4673, 4515.)

Finally, we need that our whole penal system should be taken out of the hands of the secretary of state, and, after being remoulded and settled by the law of the realm, be committed to some high functionary appointed for that sole purpose. The oversight of our penal system belongs to the province of a criminal judge, and it is an absurdity to attach it to a political office like that of a secretary of state. It would be just as wise to give Sir George Grey the oversight of the Court of Probate and Divorce.

But it is not enough to bring righteous reform into outside legislation; we must also carry it within the walls of our pri-

sons. And, first, let us build them smaller, and, if necessary, have more warders, that oversight may be more real, and discipline more effective. Most of our Public Works' prisons are divided; but at Chatham the whole of the eleven hundred men march in and out together to their work. The Commissioners ask Captain Gambier,—

“Does not that make it much more difficult to manage them than if they were broken up into small parties?” “Am I to understand by that, that the prison, which is in the form of the letter T, should be made into three separate prisons, so that only 370 could get together if they choose?” “Precisely.” “I do think so.”

Mr. Measor says of the same prison :—

“I think that after you get beyond a certain number of prisoners the force of individual evil is exercised over a greater number of men, and becomes very much greater, and therefore these very large prisons are always liable to be disturbed [by outbreaks of the prisoners]. It also directly leads to indiscriminate and wholesale punishment, which is, in my opinion, a course subversive of every chance of reformation.”

“Do you think that the difficulties you have experienced generally in convict management would be greatly lessened by keeping the convicts in smaller bodies?” “Very materially lessened.”

“Do you think that the officers would have a far better opportunity of making themselves acquainted with the men than they have now?” “Certainly, a very much greater opportunity. Under the present system no governor of a prison can know anything of many of the convicts.”—*Minutes*, 4131-2, 5533, 5620-23.

The next step would be to separate and classify our prisoners; and in this, smaller prisons would help us greatly. Common sense tells us that there are at least four classes of crime :—1. First offence in small crime. 2. Habitual offence in small crime. 3. First offence in great crime. 4. Habitual offence in great crime. Of these, the first, second, and fourth evidently form a less, a more, and a most penal class, and would demand a less, a more, and a most penal discipline; whilst the third would draw near to the second in its discipline, and to the fourth in the length of its sentence. A wise classification would do much to remove the objections raised by many of the witnesses, and to bring their opinions into accord. They differ principally in their views of the right balance of reformatory and penal elements of discipline; but if our criminals were classified, one balance would suit one class, and another another. With the first class, as the least criminal and most hopeful, reformatory elements might rightly be predominant; but with the last class, as the most criminal

and least hopeful, penal elements ought to prevail. Nor should this classification be an affair of prison discipline: it should form part of the sentence pronounced by the judge. Recurring offences should be made cumulative, so that a re-convicted criminal should, as part of his sentence, be placed in a more penal class, and subjected to more penal discipline. Re-conviction is one of the best tests of guilt, as it speaks plainly of a criminal mode of life; but we greatly need some sure method of ascertaining the fact of a previous conviction. At present, the casual remembrance of warders and policemen is our only means of recognising former criminals. (In Ireland they are photographed.) For this reason we consider the returns of re-convictions given in by Sir Joshua Jebb and Sir Walter Crofton as utterly valueless. Sir Joshua Jebb admits that out of 11,128 ticket-of-leave men released between January, 1854, and December, 1861, 1,567 have been re-convicted for light offences, and 547 for more serious ones. (*App. No. 3, H.*) That is just about nineteen per cent. Sir Walter Crofton is satisfied that ten per cent. will include all re-convictions under the Irish system; (*Min.*, 3378;) but in Ireland there is a considerable margin allowed for men 'gone abroad,' of whom no definite account can be given, and some of whom may possibly be re-convicted in England. These returns become even more doubtful when we find that with county and borough prisoners (that is, in local spheres where it is more easy to recognise them) the re-committals amount to thirty per cent. (*Min.*, 840.) It is necessary to the righteous administration of law that we should be able to identify former criminals; and for this purpose we ought to shake off our unwise prejudice against a brand. Every man who enters gaol should be branded as part of his sentence; not on the chest, where the open shirt might reveal it, but on some definite spot, say the back of the shoulder, where it could never be accidentally discovered. Our very aversion to a brand is the strongest argument in its favour. It is felt to be an indelible disgrace; but that is the very thing which a gaol residence always ought to be—a disgrace, to be remembered with regret and shame, even by a reformed man. But the advantage of a brand is, that it is a secret disgrace; it does not harden the heart against reform, nor hinder the hand in honest employment, by the scorn and reproach of our fellow creatures; while, at the same time, it is available for the purposes of justice in case of re-conviction.

It is monstrous to say that our prison discipline cannot be made more penal, when so many points admit of alteration. First, the penal period of solitary confinement should be really

nine months and really solitary, even for first offenders; and there should be work to do, as in the Irish prisons, which does not need the constant presence of teachers. For the second class of offenders who enter prison under re-conviction the nine months should be made twelve. We cannot indefinitely prolong solitary confinement; but for the very worst class of convicts there might be an alternation of twelve months' confinement, and twelve months' associated work.

As to the privilege of receiving letters and visits, about which the witnesses differ so much, the separation of prisoners into classes would probably produce a practical agreement. The first offence which may be held to imply that a man's antecedents are respectable, should allow him the softening influence of intercourse with his friends and home; but repeated offences, which may be held to imply that a man's home is among the depraved and criminal, should cut him off from the influences which are more likely to harden than to humanise.

With regard to labour, it seems difficult to lengthen hours which are even now a heavy strain upon the officers; but if we retained present arrangements for the less penal class of prisoners, we might with advantage bring back the treadmill, and even the crank, for the worst class of offenders. The treadmill should be used to grind flour, to raise water, to spin threads for weaving,—in short, to do all the mechanical work of the prison.

As to diet, there can be no question that prisoners can live in fair health and strength on less food than they have. It is fully admitted by the witnesses that the ordinary diet of our prisons is amply sufficient; the additions in the advanced stages are therefore mere indulgences. The quality, too, might be altered. Gruel is as nourishing, though not as nice, as cocoa; and something less palatable might be found than the 'very good' Indian corn and suet puddings. Such alterations should be made even for the best class of criminals; but for the worst there should decidedly be an inferior diet, varied by occasional improvement to obviate any risk of permanent ill-health. Apropos of health, there should also be some limit put on infirmary diet. We do not wish human law to take the place of that inexorable law of poverty which forbids ordinary comforts to the sick; but we might with advantage limit the doctor's supplies to a certain average in quantity and quality; that no Dr. Baly might be able to order grapes for a patient at their weight in gold.

Again, let us take away the absurd indulgence we have

hitherto afforded to our prisoners' caprice. While we are careful to guard them from their gaolers' power to tyrannise, let us guard their gaolers from their power to torment. Their causeless appeals to the directors are a nuisance; their right to have their food weighed is silly. Let the consequences of their violence be visited on themselves; let broken windows remain for a time unmended, and torn blankets unrenewed. Above all, let the governor have power to threaten punishment, and to punish promptly and efficiently. Many of the witnesses advocate flogging,—real sound flogging, not the rare and light infliction which now bears the name; they recommend the stocks, also, as a very safe and efficient restraint on the most violent, especially for women, who cannot be flogged. In all these punishments the director should receive a full statement of facts, and have power to report any undue severity to headquarters. The division of criminals into classes would furnish a weighty instrument of discipline for the refractory, if the director had power to remove a prisoner, on confirmed ill-conduct, into a more penal class, and subject him (even for the whole of his sentence, if it were necessary) to the restraints and privations that belong to that class. This would be a very serious punishment.

It seems to be fully acknowledged that much evil has been the result of unrestrained intercourse between inexperienced and more depraved criminals. The total separation of classes would prevent this; but even between men of the same class such intercourse must needs be evil. How is it that conversation is allowed between prisoners on the public works? In Holloway prison no man can speak to another without permission of his officer; and if he is detected doing so, he is reported immediately. (*Min.*, 5198.) How much more should this be the rule in our so-called penal servitude!

Even the principle of remission, though not in itself a penal element, might be made more righteous, and less liable to abuse. If we must have it, let it not be as a prison rule, which the criminal classes regard vaguely as being 'considerably larger than it really is:' let it not be as the falsification of a sentence solemnly pronounced in court; but let it be, as Sir Richard Mayne recommends, part of the sentence itself. Let the judge award the *minimum* penalty fixed by law, and then in open court *add to it* a proportional period, which may, by good conduct in prison, be remitted. And let this period be a boon clearly dependent on special good conduct, not a thing of course, only to be lost by special bad conduct. Captain Whitty says, 'it is the same thing' to win it by good conduct or lose it

by bad conduct ; but it is very far from the same thing. At present all omissions or oversights in the warders are in favour of the prisoners. They win their remission not simply by not being idle or ill-behaved, but by not being reported as idle or ill-behaved,—a very different thing. Above all, let us do away with the warders' conditional gratuities. Pay them sufficient as a fixed salary, but let them have nothing dependent on the good conduct or industry of their men. We do not need to be assured, as some of the witnesses loudly assure us, that the warders do not, will not, cannot give other than true reports of those under their charge. Human nature settles all such matters for itself ; and, without impugning the warders' integrity, no man in his senses should make it their interest to stand on good terms with the convicts, and then expect trustworthy reports of them. Also let us abolish the unrighteous rule that early misconduct in prison may be blotted out by late amendment. Let each man work out his remission faithfully, not flattering himself that he may at any time behave ill with impunity, and escape the consequence of his own deeds. Finally, let remission be much lessened, or altogether refused, to those who are re-convicted. Sir George Grey has very recently decided that in such cases no remission is to be allowed ; (*Min.*, 78 ;) but as Sir George Grey has power to undo his own decision, the point should be settled by the law of the land.

We need hardly say that the convicts' gratuities ought to be lessened. Here, also, a difference might be made between the less and more penal class of criminals. We question much whether the gratuities of the old and habitual offenders should not be paid to reformatory or emigration societies for their use, and never given into their own hands.

The question has been warmly discussed whether men released on ticket-of-leave should be subject to the superintendence of the police. One party argues that it is a wrong done to the convicts to lessen their chance of honest employment by stamping them with suspicion ; the other party alleges that it is a wrong done to society to leave them wholly unwatched and unrestrained. The division of criminals into classes would greatly simplify this troubled question. Society should yield something to a first offender, for the chance of his reform ; whilst an habitual offender should yield to society all the safety that restriction could give. We might venture something for hope's sake in one case, and demand something for fear's sake in the other.

Many of these suggestions have already been carried out in

the Irish penal system. The prisons are smaller, and the convicts, therefore, more manageable. The first stage in prison life is more penal; the confinement is truly solitary, the period is eight months, the diet is lower, the labour more monotonous, and less in need of the presence of teachers. A sort of classification has been attempted, by which the idle and refractory are separated from the ordinary prisoners. The gratuities are about half those of England, and more dependent on general good conduct. There are no conditional warders' fees. There is no assumption that ticket-of-leave men are reformed, and they are subjected to superintendence as a matter of course. The great peculiarity of the Irish system is, that the latter part of the sentence is passed in what is called an intermediate prison, to which the convicts win their way by steady industry and good behaviour, and in which they have high gratuities, high diet, and an amount of liberty which leaves them nothing penal but the name.

At the Social Science Congress at Edinburgh, the English and Irish systems were opposed to each other as if they had been radically different; and as if, moreover, the first were an utter failure, the last a great success: but the differences we have just pointed out are rather differences of degree than of principle. The Irish system has established a better balance between the penal and reformatory elements, and is, in this respect, the better of the two; but we think it has carried the scale of diet and gratuities in the intermediate prisons to great and unwise excess. These intermediate prisons are the special boast of the Irish system, and have been puffed somewhat loudly, as if they possessed peculiar reformatory tendencies. But let us look at the returns furnished by Captain Whitty himself. (*App. 10, C and D.*) Smithfield and Lusk are the two intermediate prisons. From 1856 to 1861 the number of convicts released from them on licence was 788, of which number 80, that is, nearly ten per cent., either had their licences revoked or were re-convicted. Spike Island and Philipstown are not intermediate prisons. The number released from them during the same six years was 431, of which only 21, or five per cent., had their licences revoked or were re-convicted. This does not speak of any peculiar reformatory action in the intermediate prisons. Nor do the alleged successful results of the Irish system appear before us in facts;—they appear rather in the hopes and beliefs of their warm-hearted supporters. Mr. Ranken tells us that out of 3,142 English convicts, whom the Prisoners' Aid Society has assisted during the last six years, he has reason to know that more than 2,000 are doing well;

but Mr. Organ has only given us the number of those under supervision in Ireland. Are we to understand that all under supervision are doing well? If so, we ought, at least, to know how long the supervision has lasted, to judge of the stability of their reform. But it may be said that this parallel is not just. The Prisoners' Aid Society is a voluntary organism, for which no credit is due to the government; while the Irish method of rescue is part of the government system itself. Just so; but this is the very point which we commend to its supporters' consideration. If the Irish method has succeeded, it is not on the strength or merits of system, but because the government is fortunate at present in having the very agency that belongs to voluntary societies, when voluntary societies are at their best:—that is to say, it is working the system through the heads, and hearts, and souls of earnest, devoted men. If we could command a succession of men who would devote their whole lives to the care and oversight of released convicts, it would matter very little which system we chose to adopt, so far, at least, as regards reform: but reform is the very thing which, apart from living reformers, system will never insure. The convicts in Ireland are less in number, and, therefore, more easily subject to care and oversight, and more open to individual influence; but these are the very things which could not be secured by the transfer of the Irish system into England. We must also observe that the principle of the intermediate prisons, that is, more trust and liberty, is the very principle which makes public schools better or worse than private ones. While a master's hand is over a system, increased trust and liberty will work well, and tend to strengthen self-respect and self-reliance: but when such a system is left to itself, we know by experience that increased liberty only insures increased evils and abuses. For this reason we would not make the liberty of the intermediate prisons part of any government system. If it be good to-day, it will be bad to-morrow, when the living men, who made it safe, are dead, and the dead rules survive.

Hitherto we have said nothing of the Commissioners' Report. They have given us a mild and gentle document, guarded in its statements, and qualified in its reforms. The one strong point is their recommendation of longer sentences; but, at the same time, they would make them more unreal by giving longer remissions; the *minimum* to be seven years, and the portion remitted two years and a month. (*Report*, 46.) They mildly admit 'the want of sufficient efficacy in the present system of punishment,' and guardedly express a doubt 'whether

the discretion intrusted to judges and magistrates is not upon the whole larger than is expedient.' They think that the rule which awards heavier punishment to criminals on a second conviction 'requires to be more fully acted upon;' but they are careful to add that it is 'beyond their province' to inquire how the fact of a previous conviction is to be ascertained. Whose province is it? They would have the first nine months' solitary confinement fully enforced, and made more penal in diet, and more monotonous in labour; but as for the period spent on public works, they cannot recommend more labour or less food. It would seem that the public is in error on these points.

'A very general impression appears to prevail, that the system pursued in these prisons is not of a sufficiently penal character. It has been said, that but little work is done by the convicts, that their diet is excessive, that they receive unnecessary indulgences, that their material condition is in many respects better than that of free labourers, and that consequently the punishment cannot be severely felt. We consider that upon the whole this impression is erroneous. The life of the prisoners is extremely monotonous. Having been used in most cases to constant change and excitement, they are debarred from all pleasures and amusements, they are compelled to pass their time in a dull unvarying routine of distasteful labour, and at the close of each day's work they return to the cheerless solitude of their cells.'—*Report*, 49.

Unhappy men! One would think the life of the free labourer was easy and pleasant, full of interest and amusement, the loss of which was in itself ample punishment for our criminals! The different witnesses who plead for lower diet are not listened to; but when Mr. Evans, the contractor, who looks on prisoners as mere material for efficient labour, says they have not too much food for their work, Her Majesty's Commissioners, sitting on a question of penal discipline, accept his testimony without a thought of the different aspect under which he views the case. They approve of the division of our large prisons, and of placing violent and dangerous convicts in a class by themselves, to receive a more penal treatment. They deprecate all communication with free men. They would entirely abolish warders' gratuities, and give a higher salary. They would lessen the gratuities received by convicts, and not allow any during the early part of long sentences. They would alter the principle on which remission is obtained, and make it the wages of industry, to be forfeited by fines for misconduct; and they reject the pernicious rule that that which is once forfeited can ever be regained. They advise that the chaplain should have more opportunities of seeing the convicts; for in

spite of our wishes for their reform, it appears that in the Public Works' prisons he never sees them in private. (*Min.*, 5660.) Their views of punishment are hesitating and vague. It should be efficient; therefore they recommend four dozen lashes with a heavy cat instead of two dozen with a light one, as at present. It should be prompt also; but they are terribly afraid of too much promptness. They cannot 'think it advisable to give to the governors of these establishments a general power of resorting to corporal punishment; but the directors might properly be enabled to leave with the governor conditional orders to inflict it in certain events;' and then, as if it had occurred to them that violent misconduct would rarely be a thing foreseen, they add, 'It is also desirable that a county magistrate should have authority, under a warrant from the secretary of state, to act in the place of a director in ordering this punishment for prison offences,' (*Rep.*, 52.) thus giving all power of prompt punishment back into the hands of the secretary of state. Finally, they think that convicts under tickets-of-leave should be placed under the supervision of a special officer of the convict department; and that the revocation of their licence for breach of its conditions should be made a more easy process, and be more rigidly enforced.

This is not quite as much as we could have wished, but we are glad to get even these improvements on our penal discipline. Perhaps the commissioners might have gone more deeply into reform had they not come to the conclusion that transportation was still an available means of emptying our prisons. A considerable part of the Report is occupied by suggestions referable to the penal system of Western Australia. As, however, our other Australian colonies seem determined to take the settlement of that question into their own hands, the difficulty of dealing with our criminal population remains in full force.

We must not forget to notice the Lord Chief Justice's Memorandum to the Report. While the commissioners would give long sentences, long remission, and subsequent supervision, Sir Alexander Cockburn would give short sentences and sharp discipline, without remission or supervision. He would increase the period of solitary confinement, and add hard labour to it, and perhaps more penal diet. But though this might wisely take the place of our three years (*i. e.*, two and a half) of mild discipline, he does not tell us what penalties he would impose on the crimes now sentenced to ten, fifteen, or twenty years' penal servitude. It is well known that we cannot keep up very sharp discipline for many years without

breaking down health; and the chief justice appears to have forgotten that for grave offences sentences are lengthened beyond proportion, because we cannot proportionately increase severity of discipline. He allows that long sentences had better be worked out in Australia, and for that country he would admit the principle of remission. He would thus make transportation a greater boon than it already is, and put an unequal and therefore an unjust punishment on those who cannot be transported.

We are not partial to the principle of remission, but, considering how much may be said in its favour, we think its disadvantages may be fairly met by Sir Richard Mayne's suggestion, that the period to be conditionally remitted should form part of the judge's sentence. The criminal community would soon understand what it was to get 'a five and two,' or 'a seven and three.'

And now, supposing that Western Australia fails us, what shall we do with our criminals? What shall we do with the best of them, with those who give us most hope of reform? It could not answer to make government departments reformatory; but reformatory institutions might stand in unrecognised connexion with government, and serve the purpose now sought to be accomplished by the Irish intermediate prisons. It is objected to the life at Lusk, that it has nothing penal but the name; but this would not apply to an institution which received the convicts as they came out of prison, and extended to them some degree of restraint and oversight in return for shelter and help in obtaining employment. They would enter it voluntarily; but that would make it the best test of their desire to reform; for no one would submit to oversight but those who were anxious to be guarded against themselves. From such an institution, some might be restored to their friends, some might enter honest callings, many might be draughted into the army and navy, and be absorbed without lowering the tone of the services; and for the remainder, let us hope that the world is large enough to afford room for a new penal settlement. And yet not penal in the old sense of the term; for it seems that our convicts prefer transportation to penal servitude; so that it is regarded as a boon rather than a terror, and can no longer be made a deterrent sentence. But the question remains whether a new settlement might not be made for the better class of our convicts, to which they might go bound as apprentices to give part of their time and labour to the government, (perhaps the whole of it for the first few years,) to break up the ground for a new colony. And they

might be encouraged to take wives with them at the price of so much additional time and labour.

But what shall we do with our worst convicts? If punishment is to be proportioned to crime, there is a difference between the first offence and the settled habit of offending which no righteous system of penal servitude can express, because no flesh and blood can endure it. We cannot indefinitely lower diet, and increase labour, and multiply restrictions. There is a point where penal servitude must come to a stop, and where our sense of justice demands that some other punishment shall be substituted. What is that punishment to be? Let us look steadily at the subject, and see how we are shut up to one conclusion, not by justice only, but by mercy—the mercy which would save society from the spreading pollution of vice and crime. And first let us realise the fact, that there is in our gaols a class of vicious, brutal, incorrigible ruffians, who seem equally beyond hope and shame, who are ready for any crime, and whose hideous vices betray themselves even under their gaolers' oversight. When their time is up, shall we let them go back to society, unwatched and unrestrained, to be instructors in all that is vile to less depraved offenders? We want a new principle introduced into our criminal law to meet an evil like this:—we must learn to acknowledge the cumulative guilt of crime, that men like these may be subject to heavier punishment than one offence would incur. A man who has been twice convicted of serious crimes should be placed in a black class by the solemn sentence of the judge,—placed there as a final probation, placed under the heaviest discipline of our prisons, without gratuities and without remission; and on his release be subjected for life to the supervision of the police. If, with all these terrors around him, the man return to crime as his natural element, is it not just and righteous that his renewed offences should subject him to the heaviest punishment we can give? What is that punishment to be? Humanitarians answer, Imprisonment for life. Ah! they know not what they ask. In the first place it seems doubtful whether the human mind can catch the full import of those words:—for men are not like God, who bears and bears through many a present day, yet, when He punishes, inexorably remembers the past. *We* need to punish while the sense of crime is fresh upon us; and it is much to be doubted, whether we could command strength of conviction to sustain a law that enforced punishment tens of years after the crime had ceased. Yet say that we could bring ourselves to regard great crime as subject to the same permanent

restraints as insanity; these wicked men are ten times more hard to manage than the insane, and we have not the same means of control. Shall we give our gaolers power to use handcuffs and strait-waistcoats, and to deal summarily with their prisoners' violence? That would not be allowed; yet how could we trust the lives of governors and warders to desperate men whose only hope of escape is successful violence, without giving them ample means of constraint? Difficulties surround us on every side. If we shut up these reprobates in confinement, health fails; if we allow them to associate, they corrupt each other, and sometimes their warders too; if we think of some highly penal remote settlement, such as Norfolk Island, the morals of Norfolk Island tell us what we have to expect. Every instrument of righteous punishment breaks in our hands. Shall the excess of wickedness so baffle the ends of justice? In their cumulative guilt these men are worse than many a murderer,—more dangerous to society, more ready even to commit murder, more wicked, more hardened, and far more hopeless of reform. If no laws be restraint without, if no glimmer in their dark souls be restraint within; if, on their release, without effort or pause, they go back to their old lives and commit crime again,—what shall their punishment be? Our only answer on the present occasion is this: human governments do not stand forth as the exponents of God's mercy, but of God's righteousness; yet even of His mercy it is said that 'He rendereth to every man according to his work.' *That* is the mercy of God's moral government. But if, under some mistaken view of it, we punish men unrighteously, and do *not* render to them according to their work, we may look for that increase of unrighteousness among us which is God's heaviest judgment.

ART. II.—*Report of the Manchester Church Congress.* Manchester : Hall and Roworth. 1863.

IN the autumn of 1861, a local Church association in Cambridge invited clergymen and laymen from various parts of England, to discuss with them the state and prospects of the Church of England. The energetic bishop of Oxford undertook the conduct of a similar meeting in his own diocese last year; and now the Church Congress has boldly come out into public life, held deliberation for three days and three evenings in presence of fifteen hundred or two thousand people at Manchester, promised to assemble in Bristol next year, and established itself as an organ of opinion. It may very likely reach considerable importance. Institutions of this kind are becoming popular among us. They are essentially democratic; collectors and organizers of thought, they draw public notice to points of difficulty, ventilate suggestions, and prepare the way for legislation. The British and the Social Science Associations have got firm footing, and do real service in their irresponsible way. Agricultural Societies may credit themselves with much of the improvement in our tillage of the soil. To the Church of England, a talking meeting of this sort may be made peculiarly useful. In the first place, she is thrown upon it. Her new activities have no other proper centre. The religious movement of the past century has stirred her deeply. Waking from sleep, she has found herself not only stiff from long inaction, but oppressed with arrears of labour, now not to be overtaken. Other shepherds have been appointed, and have done a great deal for the flock. But the awakening is coming at last; and on all sides we find her setting vigorously to her work. In this temper, she finds herself tied down by her legal position. Parliament is her central authority, the source of her law, the controller of her movements; and in the Parliament of the last thirty years she has not had reason to feel much confidence. That secular court, too, can only deal with large measures demanding immediate legislation. Of deliberation she has ample need. Convocation only represents the clergy, and not them in the most efficient way. Clerics and laymen may well talk together over their common charge. Again, in a Congress the conflicting schools of opinion may meet under no excitement of a practical vote, or trial of strength. They will carry the weight of character and good sense rather than of numbers. They may talk out their rival

plans, and find in how much they agree and in what important points they differ.

This large meeting is a great display of force, and will have the effect of drawing public attention to the views, projects, spirit, and general importance of the modern Church of England. In the manufacturing towns she has lost much ground,—or rather has never had much. But busy people are attracted by a busy Church. They will adhere to her the more readily for all they learn of her real anxiety to work, will contribute to her schemes, and strengthen the current of opinion in her favour. For good or for evil,—for good, as we hope,—the Church of England is gaining ground fast. Few things were more remarkable to a spectator of the proceedings of the Manchester Congress than the tone, or want of tone, of the speakers in reference to all other churches. Bitterness there was next to none. What was said was on the whole conciliatory, and affected a re-union on terms of compromise. But it is astonishing how little was said. The Church was all in all,—the Church and the people,—and for most of what passed there might never have been a Dissenter in the world. The cause was not, we are convinced, solely pride or jealousy. Many institutions and habits of Independents and Wesleyans were quoted, and held up for example;—sometimes, indeed, rather as a kind of popular trick or two worth knowing, than as a legitimate use of proper means to a successful end. Partly from ignorance, more from the directness of their aim, and intentness on their own schemes, the Church of England workers pass over the labours of others as imperfect, to be absorbed or superseded in due time by the more complete administration of the one authoritative and responsible Establishment.

Distributing the topics discussed at the Congress under the heads of the work, the agents, and the modes which the Church of England is contemplating, we take frankly this objection to her proposed task,—that she is not alone in the field; and that much, a very great deal, perhaps more than she is doing herself, is in the hands of her more or less friendly rivals, and will very likely continue there. The Nonconformists have no intention of being snuffed out. The whole labour will be enlivened by a rivalry of strength, and, in the long run, of strength of the highest kind; and it is neither an enlightened, nor a generous, nor a fair, nor a hopeful position which the Churchman assumes, who affects to ignore the obvious distribution of the Divine commission. What God hath cleansed, he is not ashamed to call common.

And this is the less excusable, that we fail to trace in the proceedings of the Manchester Congress, or in the public tone of the Church, expressed elsewhere, a sufficient appreciation of the only power which could justify her prospect of ultimately superseding the other communions. Religion is the want of the Church of England,—strong personal religion, clearly marked in her individual members, and clearly taught to, expected of, and recognised in them by their Church. We are far from denying the high religious character of large numbers of Churchmen, or the spiritual teachings of the Common Prayer. We believe that by a great revival of religion the Establishment has been saved from secular destruction; we look for its still greater increase, and are not sure but that its thorough development throughout the Church might so strengthen her natural advantages as to absorb most of the Christianity of the country. But she is encumbered with a vast majority of formal members, whose presence saps the spirit and clogs the action of the rest. Her leaders are not singly intent upon the one vital principle. They have an excessive belief in organization, activity, and prestige, in social influence and works of beneficence,—all of them essential, but all useless, ‘except the Lord,’ stone by stone, ‘build the house.’

Nevertheless, the idea which the Church entertains of her work is a high and a noble one. It is a thorough upholding of the parochial system against the congregational. It is the missionary principle as opposed to that of supply and demand. The middle classes of this country require, and readily provide, their own means of religious worship. Wherever a respectable suburb is formed, there churches and chapels rise plentifully. And in them some provision is made for the poor of the neighbourhood. But the problem of our day is how to bring the institutions of the Church home to the separate districts of the poor; and the very first step towards this implies the parochial system. Unless the responsibility be apportioned, and a special work assigned to special congregations or persons, it is too vague for effect. And although territorial division is not confined to the Church of England, and perhaps hers is not even the best form of it, yet she may certainly shame all rivals in her dogged determination to carry it into some practical operation. All churches gravitate towards mere congregationalism; they naturally are prone to build where there is prospect of speedy self-support, and the missionary temper requires constant fanning. Let the example of counting the clergy and the inhabitants,—of calculating the necessity of the whole population, and attempting to measure, not by past progress, but by what

has yet to be done,—be taken to heart by those who perhaps make better missionaries than the Church herself can obtain. There is no need, after all, to be jealous of the exclusiveness, however unjustifiable, which resolves itself into setting a lofty mark of Christian usefulness. If all churches began by considering the whole heathen poor their own special charge, and set themselves earnestly to bear it, they would soon be more glad of each other's help. In proportion as the established clergy come to deal with the large towns, they will find out the nature and importance of the real work, and recognise its effects, through whatever agency produced. And those who have the clearest view of the nature of spiritual religion can afford to take the highest ground; and, looking to the Church of the future, and overlooking the ignorance and prejudice of many of her present ministers, to rejoice in the high standard which she owns of the extent of her duty.

Of such a standard, of course, the present organism comes woefully short. Convocation some time ago recommended that not more than 1,000 souls should be considered the full care of one clergyman;—a ratio which would at once require the ordination of 2,000 men. But a general average for the whole country by no means adequately represents the lamentable defect. Multitudes of country parishes are still within the reasonable grasp of their rectors; and their supply takes off from the average ministry of the large towns. London has only one clergyman for every 6,700 inhabitants,—Manchester, for about 4,000. Birmingham employs 53 priests and deacons among 300,000 people,—Liverpool, 70 among 400,000. Particular districts are to be found which exhibit still greater disproportion. It is more encouraging to compare the present deficiency with that of sixty years ago. The great church-building movement which is associated with the name of the late Bishop Blomfield is still on the rise. Three or four thousand churches have already been planted, and from every part of the country we are continually hearing of the new triumphs of an energy which has even taken vigorously in hand the more laborious task of restoring our cathedrals. We do not grudge the money thus spent; nor are we disposed to carp at the new taste for architecture. Extravagance both of design and outlay is to be regretted; but, as every new church of any kind is the parent of more, so it is also in the main true, as was remarked at the Congress, that beautiful architecture works as a stimulant, and ugly building as a deterrent, to church extension. All kinds of public interest in the increase of the fixed capital of the Church work the same way; and many zealous amateurs

of the fine arts do more good, if not to themselves, yet to others, than they have any idea of, or ever share in enjoying. While they elaborate the symbols, others feed on the substance.

The county in which the Congress met furnishes the most conspicuous example of the needs of the times, and of the growing effort to meet them; and Mr. Bardsley of Manchester, and Dr. Hume of Liverpool, contributed careful statistical accounts of the state and increase of the Church in Lancashire. Although, during the latter part of the last century and the earlier years of the present, the population was allowed to gather altogether untended by the clergy, and the foundations of the towns were only saved by Methodism from being laid in utter ungodliness, yet for the last thirty years—Mr. Bardsley is bold enough to say sixty—the Church of England has kept pace with the growth of the shire. Between 1801 and 1831 the population doubled, and the churches increased from 251 to 301. The thirty years between 1831 and 1861 raised the census returns from 1,336,854 to 2,429,490, and the churches from 301 to 547,—figures which yield exactly the same percentage. Yet more striking improvement is shown by examining similar statistics for the southern or manufacturing part of Lancashire, alone. Nevertheless, a more accurate separation into borough and rural (every one knows what that means in South Lancashire) districts proves that it is in the smaller towns and outlying suburbs of the parliamentary boroughs that the real advantage has been gained. In the Lancashire boroughs there is provided a church for every 8,957 persons; in the rest of the county, one for every 2,674. It is perfectly clear, therefore, taking the numbers of buildings as an indication of the influence of the Church, (though of this estimate the differences of size would furnish some corrections,) that the great centres of manufacture have yet to be dealt with. It is somewhat more cheering, however, to notice the increase in late years of the rate of recovery. Mr. Bardsley showed that the new population settled in Manchester since 1851 has been supplied at the rate of a church for every 2,550, and a clergyman for every 1,760. Such a scale will, in time, do something even towards pulling down the vast arrears of neglect. But the time must be long. There are yet, in the active Manchester diocese, 44 parochial districts of more than 10,000 inhabitants each, and 12 townships, numbering from 1,200 to 9,000 souls, without church at all. And when we are told what special advantages in this respect Lancashire derived from the energetic superintendence of the late archbishop of Canterbury, we easily divine of how much darker a hue must be the picture of

other centres of population where the Church of England and the Nonconformists have alike failed to rouse themselves to the stupendous task which lies before them.

We have acquiesced in the approximate calculations of Church influence which proceed on the basis of the material provision for public worship. They are justified by two considerations: first, that the average of clergy to a Church is pretty constant; and, secondly, that attendance on public worship (which at least bears as good a proportion to the accommodation provided as it used to do) is the first palpable test of the effect of the clergy on the population. All this, however, only goes to the shell of religion. The essence of the work depends upon the supply and the qualifications of the living ministry;—the various agents, whose voice teaches and persuades, whose hand assists and relieves, whose life stimulates and directs;—the *personnel* of Church organization;—the Church herself in action. What are the failures and wants of the clergy? What can be made of inferior orders of service,—deacons, deaconesses, Scripture readers, and so forth? What other co-operation can be obtained from the laity? As for the clergy, it is complained that they are actually fewer in number and poorer in quality than they were some years ago;—and this notwithstanding the advancing requirements of the times. Instead of the 606 ordinations which took place in 1841, the year 1860 shows only 567; 1861, 570; 1862, 489; and the estimate for the year just elapsed is not greater than 460. And of these the two Universities which have always been looked to as the main feeders of the clerical stream, supply not much more than one half;—much less than one half, when allowance is made for those who are not devoted to parochial work. The rest either come from the theological colleges which have recently sprung up, and whose training does not win much favour, or enter as literates,—which, of course, too often means illiterates.

To account for so serious a falling off, several causes are assigned. The first is the many avenues which have lately been opened from the Universities into active life, and the rapid increase of employments which require and reward a liberal education, together with the rise in social status of those which do not. A gentleman whose sons not long ago had but the army, navy, Church, law, and medicine, to choose among, may now not only, at a less expense, and with greater certainty of moderate success, destine them for the Civil Service, or the various branches of scientific industry, but loses no dignity when he plants them in business, or sends them to farm the

vast tracts of the British colonies. At the same time, while the competition of professions is waxing hotter, the rewards of the clerical office are on the wane. It is notorious that, though the rise of prices has sensibly diminished the value of fixed incomes, and is likely to diminish them much more, the stipends of the clergy have received no corresponding advance. And the pressing necessities of large populations have led of late years to the creation of a vast number of pauper cures, principally in the districts where living is most expensive and the demands of charity most exacting. We are no advocates for a wealthy clergy :—that is not the question. But we agree with Mr. Espin and Mr. Stowell, who led the discussion on this question, that it is not for fear of tempting unworthy men into the sacred office that the Church should neglect to supply to its clergy whatever will make their ministry as efficient as possible. A scanty income is a temptation as well as a large one ;—only it tempts a lower class of men. And while looking for her ministers to higher than human influences, the Church has no right to belie her prayers, by putting a drag upon the impulses of the Divine Spirit. With the remarks of Mr. Espin, however, on the prizes of the clerical profession, we have no sympathy. So long as holy orders are regarded as a profession, and their pecuniary value deliberately weighed against the chances offered by other lines of business, we do not believe that the Church of England will have, or can expect, right-minded candidates. The holding out of great prizes, which are not posts of honour, toil, and large expense, but merely valuable properties, is a direct bait to worldliness. While we are not perhaps prepared to cut down the salaries of the bishops, or to reject from the ecclesiastical scheme the studious leisure of the masters of theology, we cannot but strongly desire a more equal distribution of the revenues of the parochial clergy. To say this, however, is to strike at once upon the great evil and difficulty in the working of the Church of England,—the system of patronage. In secular professions it is often too true that promotion goes by favour rather than by merit. But it is in very few that the places of trust are, as in the Church, not secretly, and under the control of a vigilant public opinion, but avowedly, the subject of ownership ;—that a responsible public officer is the nominee of an irresponsible private person. No considerations can palliate the scandal of buying and selling the cure of souls in open market. Nor can anything have a worse effect upon candidates for orders, than that valuable livings should fall to the lot of the least zealous and effective of the clergy. The sacred vows should insure,

without anxiety, a sufficient maintenance ; but they ought not to be stained with worldly ambition, and still less to be taunted with its hopelessness. We fear it is quite chimerical to look for any radical reform of this abuse ; and indeed no one seems to hint at anything further than a conscientious exercise of patronage by its present owners. The Church reformers of the day, seeing no prospect of a better system, are pushing the present one to its best results ; and Mr. Dale proposed to the Congress the course which the Lord Chancellor is adopting, of increasing the value of livings by the sale of their advowsons. No doubt some improvement may be expected in the motives of presentation ; but a general awakening of the minds of patrons to their terrible responsibility seems to us the possible fruit only of a great religious movement, which assuredly would not wait for it, and the immediate precursor of a transfer of duties so weighty to ecclesiastical hands. In the mean time, whatever is to be done for the Church, must be carried on in spite of the mischief which the inequality and the mal-administration of patronage inflicts upon the body of the clergy.

There are many excessive livings attached to overgrown parishes, which only require a common division of charge and stipend ; and towards this adjustment something is being done. There are also the funds placed at the disposal of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. Great unpopularity has fallen to the lot of that now doomed body ; but it is not always remembered how much of their attention and resources were designedly directed to the re-distribution of episcopal revenues. Some gross mistakes they are admitted to have made ; but the great cry against them probably arises from the unreasonable expectation that a mere re-adjustment of endowments could supply the needs of the growing Church. Lord Harrowby made a gallant stand at Manchester, and asserted for the Commission a very moderate per-centage of working expenses ; but a Committee of the House of Commons has reported against its present constitution, and a new management will perhaps convince the Church that it is of large current contributions that she stands most in need. The means of raising these, however, relate to the *matériel* of which we shall speak presently.

Besides the competition without and the stint within, there are certain checks which the Church of England designedly imposes upon the admission of clergy ; and which, it is said, are too violent in their action. It is of course impossible, in a paper of this kind, to enter into the many complaints and

suggestions which arise out of the Articles of Religion, the forms of ritual, and the wording of the tests by which the adherence of the clergy is secured to sound doctrine and regular practice. Mr. Stowell was, we suppose, the mouth-piece of his party, when he spoke for the abolition of the test exacted by the Act of Uniformity, and a little licence in the Burial Service, but declined the responsibility of a formal revision of the Liturgy. Archdeacon Denison perhaps as well represented his school, when he thereupon accused Mr. Stowell of 'abusing the Prayer-Book.' The controversy shows how difficult it is to touch the matter. It would be absurd to apply to a National, and therefore comprehensive, Church the principles which would readily decide the course of an independent sect. Voluntary churches are based on another principle; they can set up a severe standard; because, recognising other branches of the Church of Christ than their own, their expulsions are not in the same sense excommunication. The high-flown notions of the Church of England, which are by no means confined to the High Church party, forbid such views. Without perhaps going so far as to exile all Nonconformists from the commonwealth of Christianity, still they cannot stomach the deliberate choice by a private Christian of that form of fellowship which he deems best. Like many far less bigoted men, they still cherish, even after the experience of the last two centuries, the romantic dream of a formal unity of government and worship. Their theory therefore must either put down private judgment, in matters of discipline as well as of faith, by authority, or must seek for a breadth in the Church standards which may comprehend all sensible Christians. Accordingly, the High Church party stand by the Prayer-Book, and overrule scruples; Evangelicals ask for a moderate reform, if it were possible, and deal with Nonconformists by insisting that they ought to accept fair terms and come back: and the Broad Churchman, of course, would go to a much greater length, and tends towards a removal of all safeguards of truth. Without yielding, for an instant, to assertions of prerogative, we may readily admit that a Church which is to have any national character about it should be stringent in no point not essential to Christian purity; and if there be any great difference, to the mind of the neophyte, between declaring 'unfeigned assent and consent to all and everything contained' in a book which from end to end is conversant with nothing else than the principles of religion, and pronouncing that 'nothing contained therein is contrary to the Word of God,' it would be a useful concession to

conscience to do away at once with the force and the ugly memory of the Act of Uniformity. The Burial Service is the pinching point of the rubric, because it alone, of the more obnoxious formularies, is constantly demanded by the people. So much of obscurity hangs over the views even of the least mystical sacramentarians, that the expressions of the Baptism and Communion services are used with little gloss by most clergymen; and the visitation of the sick is usually conducted in a much less formal manner than that prescribed. But the Burial Service only carries out the policy which declines to pronounce upon any evidence of character short of open immorality; and if the Lord's table were as strictly protected in practice as it is fenced in invitation, the strong hope of the Church might well preach the resurrection over the graves of her professed penitents. On the other hand, it would be very hard to place the feelings of Christian families at the mercy of every young prater of the maxim, 'Dissent is schism, and schism is sin.'* The difficulty is not confined to the Church of England. How many a Nonconformist pastor has screwed his conscience up to the decent interment of a hearer who has died notoriously covetous, or fraudulently bankrupt, or suspected of suicide! On the whole, if this simple relaxation can be carried by so general assent as not to lead to dangerous change, it may be well: but rather than throw the Prayer-Book into the cauldron of Parliament, we should leave the law as it stands, wink at occasional infractions, and look for a discipline which may bring the Church nearer to the standard of her rules. This class of difficulties has not much effect on the numbers of the clergy. Few minds weigh small points against the mass of duty. The question among clergymen and students is one of reform, rather than of repudiation. And the same is true even of those deeper questions which affect the heart of Christian doctrine. It is notorious that those who most openly disapprove of the Articles are the last to see any inconsistency in their position. To us it seems one thing to accept the Articles and Liturgy as a compromise of difficult and subordinate theories, and the actual practice of the Church as explanatory of a partly obsolete rubric, and quite another to preach heresy from the parish pulpit, and denounce the Articles, the Creeds, and the Scripture as an unfit basis of authoritative religion. The scepticism of the day, however, we are glad to hear it said from Oxford, does not materially

* This wise saw is actually ascribed to one of the Cambridge Professors of Divinity.

deter students from the ministry. At all events, we concur cordially in the opinion that men so lost are better lost. If a man is not prepared to preach with the authority of his Master the dogmatic truth of the Bible, he had better not preach at all. Let him wait till his own mind is settled; and if that is never to be, let him take to anything but the spiritual guidance of others. Perhaps, however, the religious condition of Oxford and Cambridge, and indeed of society at large, has more influence upon the numbers of the clergy than is directly observable. Few may avowedly abandon their intended profession on the score of disbelief;—perhaps, indeed, the Oxford teaching would hardly lead to such a step:—but in fewer is the intention ever formed. Scepticism draws men to the world. And when it is earnest and painful, it affects a class of minds which, under the influence of truth, might have done eminent service to the Church.

It is clear, however, on the whole, that the failure of efficient clergymen is not to be made up by alterations of the standards of doctrine or ritual; and the Church of England must throw herself upon some direct stimulus to orders. Probably the apparent evil is in itself a good, and will lead to more good in the attempts to remove it. The great increase which we have seen in the religious zeal of the Church must have had its influence upon the minds of the young; and while it has improved the character of many aspirants to the gown, it has no doubt warned multitudes of the careless from the sacred office. And we are willing to believe that the bishops are far more careful in their tests of personal character than formerly. Concentration is better than lax extension. This point, indeed, seems at once obvious and fundamental. The clergyman who is not strongly possessed with the spirit of the religion he is to inculcate is in effect no clergyman at all. But the Church of England is still, we fear, very negligent in its requirements of piety. When multitudes of candidates present themselves who have little or no notion of spiritual religion, something more is needed than a decorous behaviour, and the transient religious sentiment which the solemnity of ordination must surely excite in a youthful mind. There is at least one party in the Church which believes in conversion, and must hold it an essential condition of the ministry. How was it that at the Manchester Congress no word of all this was heard, beyond a general recognition that the Holy Spirit is the only sender of fitting labourers? Do the Evangelicals really believe that the graces of the Spirit manifest themselves,—that His operation is clear and conscious,—that there are any means of discovering

whether an honest youth is awake to Christian truth and practice or not? Are they satisfied with the fineness of their sieve? We are grieved to think that, in allowing the discussions to pass with so little remark on the moral qualifications for the ministry, they abandoned the position that has been given them to defend,—the defence of which is their work and their stay,—which if they do not defend, they will go down before the mighty earnestness their rival parties are throwing each into its special labours.

Keeping up, then, and even tightening, the tests by which the sacred office is guarded, its supply is rightly, we think, held to depend properly upon the earnest preaching of duty, and the judicious supervision of the pastor. The Church of Christ should only ordain upon application, and look for the original bent to the highest sources. There is far too much family bringing up for the ministry. The Ember season affords an opportunity, now sadly neglected, for the special prayers of the Church for a faithful clergy. But, apart from this, and not taking up the subject of remuneration, much may be done by increasing the facilities for preparation. The best class of men in whose minds is revolving the idea of clerical work,—those who most fully feel the responsibility of their undertaking,—lay the greatest stress upon the training which alone can fit them for their purpose. It is the thoughtless who, with a rashness too often mistaken for superior zeal, rush into the most awful of vows. And a really good and attainable theological education will do much to draw, as between one Church and another, the earnest men who are more anxious to be employed for good than careful under what particular supervision they are to be authorised to labour.

To the training, therefore, of the clergy the attention of the Congress was seriously called. We have seen that the universities no longer provide as they did; and it is the opinion of those best informed that no increase can be looked for from the ordinary current of gownsmen. Several schemes, however, are proposed for stimulating the clerical production. A general lowering of the cost of college life is, we are convinced, not to be forced for any such special purpose. The universities are a part of middle-class life, and will follow the scale of expenditure which obtains in society at large. It is of little (though undoubtedly of some) use to diminish the mere college fees, where the expenses are, in fact, regulated by the average means of the men. Nor could much advantage be gained by the foundation of private halls. Even granting to these the rank of colleges, their inmates are either to mix fully with the general society

of the university, in which case they will, in fact, spend pretty much the same money; or they are to be a special and marked society of their own, in which case it is very doubtful whether the mere advantage of a degree would not be bought too dear. There are already colleges, both at Oxford and Cambridge, where the fees, for the sake of poor students, are brought down as low as possible; and they are not the fullest. Mr. Espin tells of a fund started for assisting men through the university into orders. But this plan, as well, perhaps, as that of private halls, lies under the grave reproach of inducing very young men to destine and pledge themselves for the ministry before they have undergone the severe ordeal of university life. The danger would be less, if it were not for the loose practice which prevails. Many gownsmen, as it is, have little choice, at the close of their student life, but between starvation and orders; and now that other chances of livelihood are opening, it would be a great pity to fill the colleges with men trapped, in their sentimental days, and by the bright prospects of intellectual distinction, into an honourable understanding, which their principles might be strong enough to carry out, and yet to regret. No such difficulty arises in the case of the modern theological colleges. Their education is special, and will be sought only by those whose mature mind is made up. And as, whatever may be thought of clerical scholarships or halls, money is not likely to be forthcoming to establish them on any considerable scale, it is upon non-university institutions that the Church must unwillingly rest her hopes.

Unwillingly; for, while a high standard of education is felt by all British Churches to be increasingly important to their clergy, it is above all essential to those of the National Church. By it alone can the social status be preserved which gives the Church, and therefore, in this case, religion, so strong a hold on the upper classes of this country. By it alone can that respect for the clerical office be sustained, which the experience of all Christendom has shown to be necessary to a healthy condition. The pastor must be in marked superiority to the majority of his flock; and, though no merely intellectual advantage can avail in the absence of the moral supremacy of character, yet it is fatal to place the growing mind of the people habitually under the teaching of men whose knowledge of the doctrines and institutions of religion they cannot respect. But the Church of England must submit, as other Churches have to submit, to the necessity of supplying the imperfect training which is possible; and, in the absence of a well-grounded education, must add to her professional instruction

such general polish as can be quickly applied. The complete recognition of this necessity may perhaps lead, according to Mr. Espin's suggestion, to the better regulation of the modern colleges. The ten or eleven of these institutions which are now recognised by the bishops are endeavouring to attain a common action and the assistance of the universities. It is proposed that Oxford and Cambridge shall affiliate them, and examine them, as is done with middle-class schools. The double end would thus be answered of a substantial improvement in the education of the colleges themselves, (which some of them greatly need,) and of publishing that improvement, and securing for their successful students something of the social position which is now reserved for the graduate. We apprehend, also, that the bishops would probably ordain, as a rule, only such candidates as might satisfy the university examiners; and the rejection would be secured of some poor but stupid youths, whose own tutors, pitying their circumstances, or respecting their good intentions, would naturally incline to hope for the best, and risk the worst.

In one respect, at least, the theological colleges of the Church of England have a vast advantage over the universities. They do attempt some professional training. Theology is not seriously taught at either Oxford or Cambridge. It is true that there are able professors of divinity, that the professors give lectures, that the lectures are attended by students, and followed up by public examinations, which the bishops require their candidates to pass. But the whole machinery is of very trifling value. University education is not carried on by means of professors' lectures. Theology is not a paying subject. It is not within the competition which attracts the ambition of the men, nor does it offer the prizes to which they look for subsistence. It is not intended that they shall pay much attention to learning it. They are there for the purpose of general education, and the whole genius of the place forbids professional study. Very few can afford to remain beyond their undergraduate terms. The majority must at once seek the emoluments of a profession for which they have made little or no preparation. A few of the new Church colleges, like Cuddesden, open their doors to the graduate who desires and can wait for a special training; but the vast majority of men are considered by their friends as provided for when the degree is attained, and, thrown upon their own resources, must go forward without delay. It is not easy to see any remedy for this. The evil is patent, and was denounced at Manchester in the strongest terms. 'Education,' it was quoted, 'consists in learn-

ing to do when young that which a man will have to do when old.' The senior wrangler often cannot read the service fit to be heard. The first-classman preaches lithographed sermons. And although deeper views of clerical duty are, no doubt, rapidly bringing the modern curates to throw their whole minds into their work, it is not fair to expect from the average graduate the power of picking up, untaught, a practical profession.

The special training of a clergyman has three branches,—theological learning, the art of preaching, and the duties of the pastorate. The first can never be more than commenced at college; it is his life's study, and, if he be an educated man, the want of timely groundwork may perhaps be remedied. But how often is it remedied? How many young curates are left absolutely in the dark how to begin the study? They read the new-school sermons; they buy the red-edged divinity; they write neat compositions, and enforce the more obvious practical duties with great warmth. But what help have they ever received towards the vast scheme of biblical truth? They lack, and lack for ever, that primary outline of Christian theology which alone can lay a firm basis for reading and thought. How much that is narrow results from ignorance of the lofty topics of the Bible! how much that is false from ignorance of the simple ones!

We cannot discuss the causes which have led the Church of England to undervalue the pulpit. Even at this Congress we see little trace of the real function of the preacher, as an expounder to the mass of the people of the whole truth—simple and profound. The speakers have little idea how far a thoroughly religious, though ignorant, congregation may be orally taught to understand the Scripture. This, however, at least, seems to be fully felt,—that there is an art of composition and delivery which has vast power in attracting congregations, and whose successful culture by Nonconformist preachers must be imitated by the clergy. The Englishman, it is said, will have a good article for his money. In this sense it is no doubt true that a good preacher has always a full church. We should be sorry indeed to see the 'sensation' school of oratory finding many disciples in the Church of England; and the graces of style are a miserable screen for meagre matter; but it is of no use to preach the Gospel in a dull drone, to lead public prayer as a school-boy repeats his half-understood lesson, or—we may safely add—to expect the common people to listen with care to the reading of a written sermon. What is wanted in the pulpit is a

habit of plain and easy speaking, which will neither allow the preacher, without dulness, to fall back on commonplaces, nor to utter what he does not mean or understand, nor to excite himself by loud or rapid bombast;—which will make it essential for him to have a great deal to say, and to depend for his effect absolutely upon lodging the substance and thought of his discourse in the minds of his hearers. Oratory is as simple as it is difficult, and any evasion of the difficulty is altogether beside the mark. The student *must* learn how to catch the sympathy of his audience; and if he have little assistance from natural temper, he must work for it as is done in other professions. One encouragement he may remember:—that it is easier to be a successful orator in the pulpit than in any other place. There at least he may rely upon the sympathy with his subject which conscience will return to his serious address, and the special promise of his mission that that sympathy shall be waked for him into supernatural vigour. We trust, and in the main believe, that the fear of competition and the pressure of demand will not direct such of the clergy as are waking up to a sense of the power of preaching, to false models. The true remedy for both dull and exaggerated styles lies in preaching the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth; and the necessary polish of manner is not difficult to attain, even by students of small education.

And the same remark applies to the training for pastoral work. The Church of England has in her diaconate a school of parochial experience, which the modern curate system has greatly extended. But the practice of large towns is to create new incumbencies so fast, that perhaps the wholesome term of subjection is too soon passed, and an entire congregation committed to immature hands. For this reason—to anticipate a little—we are not favourable to the immediate separation of new ecclesiastical districts. It would be better that the growing parish should be worked under one head, even after new churches are built, than that comparatively young clergymen should be left to the distant superintendence of the bishop. It cannot, however, be too strongly insisted upon, that the pastoral influence springs from the pulpit. The Church of England, we fear, does not so believe; and until she does, her clerical power will be more social than religious. The influence of the clergy was once founded upon superstition; it is now controlled by intelligence—altogether overborne by it, if the intelligence be not taught religion. People will not take the advice, or submit to the influence, of those whose public teaching they are forced to despise as weak or unreal. The influence of the

pastor, if it be anything, is a constant power over conscience. His presence must set his people thinking on their ways, and make them ashamed—afraid—of sin or frivolity. He must not only set before them the highest example of life, but it must be an example which controls, subdues, inspires. And this command is only to be acquired by a lofty enforcement of the truth from the pulpit. Pastoral influence is a continuation in private life of the same sympathy which is generated by the appeal to and response of conscience: it is a conservation of force; and, strengthened from Sunday to Sunday by the hallowed memories of the spiritual life, grows into a tie of Divine power to mould the character into active Christianity.

In the extension of theological institutions, therefore, both for graduates and others, the Church has a means of vastly increasing the power of her pulpit, and, through it, of her whole machinery. And there seems no reason why they should not be a part of the organization of every diocese. Large central colleges might, indeed, have a better effect in opening the minds of ill-educated students, and avoiding narrow party spirit. But the advantage is more than counterbalanced by the necessity for direct personal supervision of the lower class of learners. The system should be tutorial. Whichever plan be pursued, the cathedral endowments seem able to afford great assistance to these foundations. The deanery of Exeter has recently been twice filled so as to make its occupant the principal of a college; and surely theological education is an object which might without envy draw to it the ancient wealth of the chapter-houses.

On the comparative rates of improvement of the actual character of the clergy, and of its accepted standard, it will depend whether or not we are to expect fewer or more cases of discipline. The number is not now large; but it is, nevertheless, sufficient to make the ecclesiastical courts a subject of as much importance as difficulty. The Church Discipline Act of 1840 is acknowledged to be a failure. Under it, every charge may be tried four times over. First, there is an inquiry before a commission appointed by the bishop; then, if the commission report a *prima facie* case, there is a trial in the Bishop's Court, and after that in the Archbishop's, and at last in the Privy Council. And though the practice of all dioceses, we believe, except that of Manchester, is to avoid the Bishop's Court altogether by means of letters of request; yet three trials of a plain case of immorality seem rather more than practical justice demands. The mischief of so tedious and expensive a course is notorious. Either the prosecuting bishop

must pay for his strictness, or he must appeal to charitable or party subscription. The remedy is not so clear. The bishop of Oxford is no doubt right in saying that a firm but kind administration will prevent a great many crimes from going to the scandal of a public trial at all, by inducing the guilty to confess and submit. A clergyman under grave charge is not in the position of an ordinary citizen. His relation to his superior is not that of prisoner and judge. It is held by many that a guilty man may, in point of morals, take the full benefit of a trial and the possible failure of evidence. Certainly this is not true of a minister of Jesus Christ. He must be above suspicion. He is bound to protect the Church, at the expense of his own position. But there must always be a residue of cases to be tried strictly. Several suggestions of reform are made,—some with much confidence. To abolish any of the steps in the scale of appeal is to break in upon ecclesiastical precedence:—not that that seems a very practical difficulty. The functions of the preliminary commission would be satisfied by a far less formal inquiry than is now made. To us it appears that the division of crimes, which is successfully practised in civil procedure, might be applied to the clergy. It is absurd to send a charge of drunkenness to be tried by the Dean of the Arches, and appealed to the Queen in Council. It would be altogether unfitting to leave an accusation of heresy to the final adjudication of a local court. For the former class of cases, inquiry and a conclusive trial in the Bishop's Court seem sufficient. They raise simple questions of fact, and do not involve those nice legal definitions of crime which exercise the Court of Criminal Appeal. Mr. Beaumont even proposed to submit them to a mixed jury of clergy and churchwardens. The latter class are satisfied by no inquiry. The charge of false doctrine, once raised, is almost invariably contested, and can hardly be disposed of, except by the highest central authority. To any practical improvement, however, so eminent a civilian as Dr. Bayford acknowledges himself unable to see his way; and the whole question will probably rest as it is until some enormous scandal forces it upon the tardy attention of Parliament.

Increase, train, and purify the clergy as you will, it must always be felt that their order can neither perform the work of the Church, nor remove from the body of the laity the responsibility of spreading the kingdom of Christ. Throughout the proceedings of the Congress, we hear sounding from time to time the note of disappointment at the apathy and inertia of the unordained. Even allowing for the low average of personal

piety which so comprehensive and lax a Church naturally presents, the established clergy do not seem to have the system or the knack necessary for enlisting the laity among the missionary labourers. We have a right to look for the causes of this special failure to the clergy. They are the natural leaders of the Church, and, not only in law but in fact, responsible for her various efficiency. If the religious laymen do not help them, it must be either that they will not have help, or that they neglect to ask for it. To this Mr. Rowsell bears witness. Complaining bitterly of the isolation of the clergy, he ventures to speak to his brethren of a pride of orders, a caste feeling, a fear of not magnifying their office, which must be fatal to all proper co-operation. And he testifies warmly of the assistance called forth by his own appeals. To the same effect speak Mr. Cadman and the dean of Chichester. The clergyman must rely not on his cassock, but on his character. He is president, not dictator, of the Church's work. He must not enforce his own hobbies, but take and abide by counsel. He has, by his moral command over the parish, every chance of making his own opinion sufficiently felt. Mr. Rowsell and Mr. Cadman have gathered their experience in large London parishes. The one speaks of the difficulty of obtaining help; the other, of the right direction of youthful zeal. Perhaps the difference is between Stepney and Marylebone,—perhaps it is between the Broad and Low Church. Preaching a happier Christianity, Mr. Cadman may have found his converts' energies answer more cheerfully to his touch. But Mr. Rowsell's view of parochial duty, though far too little reliant upon the direct regenerating effect of Christian truth, includes all possible means of improving the condition of the poor; and for this indirect work he requires an amount of regular and laborious effort which is very difficult to be got out of this busy generation. This view, however, keeps him outside the error which seems to pervade the theories of most of the other speakers on this subject. The laity are not, in their eyes, to share in the direct teaching work of the Church. Finance is to be committed to them. Clergymen are admitted to be, in the mass, unfit accountants. Of course laymen must find the money. They are to be a body of counsellors on parish matters. They are to share in instructing the young, and to go among the poor. But we do not see any notion of committing to them a part in the preaching of the Gospel or the spiritual oversight of the Church. We take this error to be fundamental and practical. It is religion, pure as they have received it and practise it, which is the one thing they can, as

Christian men, teach to others. This is the channel into which the freshest energy runs. Direct work is the simplest and easiest; and a clergyman who neglects to obtain it, loses an engine by which his personal religious influence may be multiplied manifold. There is no fear, in the Church of England, of such agencies running wild and lacking proper direction. They require the control of the responsible ordained pastor; but the control is only liable to be lost by a weak and inefficient pastorate; and against this the permanent settlement of the clergy gives them every advantage. But what the Congress means by the co-operation of the laity seems to be confined to the charitable works which are collateral and introductory to the direct inculcation of the truth.

Of these, two attracted special attention. Men are seldom at leisure for visitation, and there are peculiar functions which absorb many of them. From Christian women the most and the best works of healing are to be obtained. And the Church is trying two schemes, which are partly in rivalry. The first, imported from Germany, consists of an order of deaconesses,—not a sisterhood,—protected by no vows, marked by no badge. It aims at including, in a common mission, women of all ranks, who undergo first a short inspectory trial, and then a year's training in the hospital, and in some knowledge of the Scriptures; so that (though this object is not put forward) it may be intended that some religious exhortation and instruction should find its way to the visited poor. This probation gives opportunity for a thorough test of religious character, and is crowned by the bishop of London's certificate. A central institution provides the deaconesses with a cheerful home, and keeps them within easy range of clerical supervision; but we do not understand that residence in it is necessary, or that those pious ladies are refused the desired training and authority whose situation in life furnishes them with the best of all helps to charity—a family home.

The second plan is that suggested in a popular little book, entitled *The Missing Link*; and is founded upon the belief that the poor are most ready to receive help and advice from women of their own rank. Accordingly, suitable persons are engaged by the ladies who manage this mission, are paid a moderate wage, and employed in attempting a thorough reform of the homes of the poor. The success which this system, with its mothers'-meetings and sales of household stuff, has met with is too well known to need mention here; but we may say that the whole scheme is much recommended by its simplicity, modesty, and directness. It may be—it is—carried out

wherever a few ladies and a few subscriptions can be got together; and it does not profess to depend upon system, but entirely on the personal character of its agents, who, at least if the jealousy we have deprecated hinder not, may carry their Bibles and their pious talk wherever a kind heart and a ready hand can make them an opening.

So much for the agents who wear the official uniform of the Church. Of Sunday and day-school teachers not much passed at the Congress worthy of notice, except the complaint that male Sunday teachers do not prepare their lessons. In the crowd of members not yet accredited to regular service there is hidden a vast fund of power, which greater spirituality will infallibly call into play. But, after all, it is possible to over-organize. There must always remain innumerable works of irregular and unsystematic piety, for which the guerillas will be on the watch. And when we raise our eyes to a broad view of the office and dignity of the Church of Christ, the truth comes clearly to be seen that the whole lives of Christian men and women are silently working the mightiest influence of all in that ceaseless testimony which their conduct bears to the power, the necessity, and the joy of religion.

Meeting to converse freely about the modes of accomplishing their common objects, it was not to be expected that the members of this Congress could avoid discussing seriously the constitution of the Church of England. The Church is heaving with life, which craves a regular form of expression; and it is at least out of accordance with modern ideas that an active body should not exercise the powers of self-government. Accordingly, Mr. Emery, a Cambridge tutor, if we mistake not, read a long paper on church-meetings, and especially on the introduction into them of laymen. Adopting the ancient divisions of the rural deanery, the diocese, and the province, he desires to see organized mixed assemblies in each. The clergy, such of the churchwardens and sidesmen as are communicants, and one or two laymen nominated by the bishop or rural dean, might form the rural-decanal synod. The diocese might meet by deans, archdeacons, rural deans, and by representatives, clerical and lay, from each inferior synod. A general provincial convention would complete the scheme. That some such system can be worked on a new soil, is proved by the experience of American and Colonial Episcopal Churches. That there is prospect of giving it legislative authority in this country, within any period over which it is wise to look forward, we have not the smallest belief. Two grave, noted, and powerful objections lie in its way. In the

first place, the field is occupied by another system. The project is one, not of reform, but of revolution. It involves the displacement of a strong government and the setting up another. Whatever may be said of the theoretical absurdity of committing Church legislation to the hands of a mixed body of Christians, Jews,—not Turks yet,—infidels, and heretics, nevertheless the Imperial Parliament, on *internal* Church questions, is, in fact, an assembly ruled by members of the Church of England. The Church of England is so strongly represented there, that though her relations to the civil constitution are, of course, discussed by others than partisans, or even friends, of her own; yet the good sense of men, whose elections depend very much on their professing at least a general attachment to her cause, warns them from a hostile interference with any matters merely ecclesiastical. The Church is intelligently and, on the whole, honestly administered by Parliament; and it would take a great deal of talking to persuade the English mind that a new paper constitution would do the work better. The second objection is, that the Church of England has a civil aspect, of which it is altogether impossible for her to divest herself. Whatever sympathy we may feel for a Church which feels its spiritual powers, its benevolent energies, hampered by foreign control; yet we are citizens as well as religionists, and, with the roll of British and European history before us, we refuse to look upon our established Church merely in the light of her religious mission. The inevitable tendency of all separate action on the part of the Anglican communion is to divide her from the State, cast off all bands, and assume the full pretensions—not of an humble society of private Christians, organized for strictly religious purposes, of balanced powers, and modest ecclesiastical views—but of an authoritative branch of the one Catholic Church. The Church of England has the Middle Age traditions upon her, in spite of her Protestantism, her Reformation, her education; and we are by no means devoid of the fear, which possesses most strongly the public mind, that the causes which forced the King and Parliament of England long ago to take her in charge have not yet ceased to operate. We are no despisers of the clerical office; but its exaggeration produces in narrow minds—and where are not those?—a force, to balance whose dangers we see with some patience many opinions flourish that are low and defective. As to the effects of unfettering the Church, upon the Evangelical clergy, upon the powerful upper class, upon her own property and position, these are questions which are better not raised. Two forces, in modern times, check

the natural excesses of clerical prerogative,—the spread of knowledge, and the power of the purse; and, in case of a practical separation of Church and State, it might become a political necessity to supplement the defects of the former safeguard, by throwing the Church entirely upon the current contributions of her members. The conditions of perfect independence, large endowment, and traditional prestige, have at least never been tried together since the rise of civil liberty.

So we do not think it likely that Parliament will relinquish its ecclesiastical functions. It is, however, possible that the various local assemblies spoken of might be organized without attaining the authority which the majority of the Congress seemed to desire, and which we deprecate. Especially the lay and clerical meetings of each rural deanery appear admirably calculated to take in hand practical questions of Church extension. The building of new churches, the division of parishes, the salaries of the clergy, are all matters which require some central, and yet not distant, authority, which might overrule and appease local jealousies, and strengthen by combination every good cause, but avoid the mischiefs of ignorance and routine. The way to obtain necessary power for this purpose is just the way the Church is taking,—namely, to act without authority. We are told of an association of parishes in Surrey which in a very few years raised the endowment of every cure within its district to a *minimum* of £200, and dissolved,—its work done. Cambridge and Warrington have both tried the ruri-decanal meeting with success. In Exeter there was a diocesan synod some years ago; and Ireland has just furnished another. The example of the colonial Churches is also exerting a powerful influence at home; and we fully expect to see these larger conventions spring up under the English sees;—for better, if they will only deal with plain matters of practical duty;—for worse, if they attempt to grasp legislative power, and strive to free themselves from the control, and therefore the countenance, of the state.

The Church of England has one mode, *par excellence*, of doing her work; and that is by mapping out the whole country into districts, and assigning to each its clergy. We have seen that the necessities of the times have altogether outrun the growth of this system. Only in 1858, the House of Lords' committee on spiritual destitution found a town containing 14,000 people and only one small church. Whatever work the Church now sets herself, must of course follow her organic principle, and be also parochial. The main question, therefore, in Church extension would seem to lie between the immediate division and

the simple strengthening of parishes. The argument for division seems to rely on the original idea of a parish;—that it is a district of such size that the clergyman, without an excess of curates, shall know and visit the whole population, and be able to accommodate them in his church. It is also to be said that a small cure gives definition to the work, and a more individual responsibility, and that a church is a natural centre. And perhaps the strongest reason of all flows from the uncertainty of patronage, and the appalling mischief which is done by putting a large town parish under an incompetent head. On these grounds Mr. Hugh Birley, who is renowned in Manchester for his efforts in extending the influence of the Church of England, fixes 5,000 as the *maximum* population on which it is safe to speculate.

Much, however, may be said in favour of a more cautious and tardy procedure. It has been well said that there are two modes of propagation,—by cuttings and by layers; and that it is only strong shoots that will strike at once of themselves:—most being the better for a connexion with the original feeding stem, until they have had a little time to form roots of their own. So we are inclined to think that it is better, even in the extreme case of the vast metropolitan parishes, to organize and lay them out into conventional districts, worked at first by separate curates under one responsible rector. The cheapness of a curate, as compared with the smallest stipend which can be allotted to the incumbent of a new parish, we regard as rather an evil than an advantage; for the standard £100 a year is altogether insufficient for any but a young man in his earliest years of ministry;—though it is at least clear from many of the necessary claims which mulct the income of an incumbent. But the centralising system undoubtedly enables large town districts to be taken in hand with less outlay than is required for the erection of a new place of worship. First, the mother church, standing in the midst of a dense population, may be used more frequently than for the two conventional Sunday services. In large towns there are often whole congregations of people who could most conveniently attend at very early or very late hours. For such purposes, as well as for week-day worship, special forms, or special arrangements of the existing liturgy, are asked for. And, without desiring to touch the valuable habit of the respectable middle classes to devote the best parts of the Lord's day to two stated services, long enough to be powerful feeders of religion, and really to occupy what is too apt to lapse into an idle holiday, we yet have strong sympathy with Mr. Cadman's remark, that anything lawful which breaks up the monotony, indifference, and

apathy of a vast ungodly London parish is at least worth trying. The curate, moreover, of a sub-district may commence by preaching, lecturing, and reading the Scriptures in school-rooms, houses, or the open air. He will gather children and then adults about him by degrees, and be ready for his own licensed school-room, which in the end will probably develop into the full machinery of a parish. By that time the curate has gained his experience, and is ready to be incumbent; the district has learnt something of religion, and has got a school and a congregation; and the central buildings are put up. Nothing remains but formally to sever the connexion which has ceased to be necessary.

The division of parishes, however, is not a mere matter of expediency; it has given rise to one of the most complicated and unmanageable branches of the law of England. The Church Building Acts are of proverbial intricacy; and though the Legislature has them under consideration, it has not yet taken even the first step of consolidating them. An elaborate paper on the legal aspect of Church extension was read at Manchester by Mr. Dale, a lawyer. He suggested a new working body of commissioners charged with church building, and a simplification of the various modes and conditions of dividing parishes, which would recognise only four ecclesiastical classes,—new parishes, Peel districts, (which are endowed districts without churches,) endowed churches without districts, and chapels of ease. The legal separation of a district should, he thinks, be made completely, or not at all. The main part of Mr. Dale's address turned on two great aids to extension,—patronage and pew rents. Under the present law, the commissioners may give the patronage of a church to any one who builds it, or who contributes sufficiently to its endowment. Mr. Dale, with a recklessness of private interests rare in a lawyer, and not very likely to inspire confidence in buyers, proposes to confer the additional power of confiscating the patronage of under-endowed parishes, and re-selling it in augmentation of the invested funds. This is what the lord chancellor has just done with his smaller livings; and corporations and public bodies might perhaps be treated as official holders of their benefices, and compelled to surrender them; but we confess to a shrinking from so wholesale a recognition of the patronage system. Church-building is best founded upon so great a public interest as can do without buying and selling; and the presentation to a low town parish, with a meagre income, does not easily attract purchasers.

In default of a successful scale of patronage, it is proposed to rely upon pew rents. Already, it seems, the Ecclesiastical

Commissioners may consent to the raising of money on security of pew rents, but the refusal of the bishops to consecrate churches in debt renders the power a dead letter. Mr. Dale would have the Commissioners lend their own funds. The system is recommended by its success among the Nonconformist bodies, though by some it has been carried to great abuse. In suburban neighbourhoods a church is sure to pay for itself. The Commissioners would receive an authority to fix and alter the scale of pew rents, which might with great advantage be extended to all the rented churches in the kingdom.

Of course the enunciation of such views brought down a storm of disapprobation. Manchester is a focus of the 'free and open church' movement. No one of the important, and some of them, one would think, popular, subjects which came before the audience in the Free Trade Hall, elicited nearly as much display of feeling as the economical question of letting pews. Perhaps the reason is, that besides the great scandals which give the opponents of seat-rents a footing, their opinions are based upon a pretty ecclesiastical sentiment. There should be no proprietorship, say they, in the house of God. On its floor all men are equal, rich and poor must sit together, and no distinction be allowed. The climax of this traditional notion aims at the substitution of chairs for pews, and the separation of the sexes. For the sentiment of equality we have the strongest sympathy, and desire it fostered by usage as far as possible. And we heartily respect the feeling which leads Churchmen of all schools to desire by all means to keep up the idea that their Church is the Church of the poor, to whose ministration all have a right. But neither of these views need carry practical men further than to secure ample, and not contemptuous, accommodation for all the poor who are reasonably likely to come. That rich and poor should sit together, does not mean, —what neither rich nor poor can ever be brought to,—that pew by pew they should be intermixed. The social element of Christian worship is as important as the recognition of the common sins, hopes, and privileges of all men. Religion proceeds from the individual to the family; and in its gathered strength is transplanted to the house of God, where, in full brotherhood of the whole Church, but also surrounded by the kindling associations of friendship, it breathes itself into society. The family pew is an invaluable Christian institution. Again, the very poor, no more than the middle-class people, like to jar upon the ideas of worship by mixing, formally, and for the assertion of a principle, with those among whom, on any other day in the week, they could not live with comfort. Education

and refinement of manners produce, among their benefits, this difficulty, which is felt elsewhere than in the house of God. And we do not think that a forced levelling is the way to remove it. The appropriation of seats is partially adopted even where it is not recognised; and the addition of a rent produces no practical evil, while it undoubtedly gives stability to the habit of contributing for the support of religion. It is right that every man should pay who can, and a wholesome thing to mark him if he do not.

In the mean time, however, the 'free and open church' movement has its lessons. It may help to diminish among us the demand and supply principle. While it is obligatory upon the competent to pay, the advantages of public worship are equally the right of all. Pew rents are not a purchase of preaching, but a mode of fixed contribution. The hire of the labourer is paid to the servant of the Church out of the common fund, and not from the money of the few. In the sacred treasury gifts have another than pecuniary value. And it is constantly necessary, especially for the faithful and zealous men who manage the finances of our churches and chapels, to check their desire for a large income, and allot large, commodious, and attractive space for the poor. It requires no small sacrifice to maintain this at a popular chapel in a respectable neighbourhood; but it is of the very essence of Christian worship; and who knows what influence it may have on the real success which is not commanded by an overflowing congregation and a flourishing ledger? The grosser scandal of absolute proprietorship of pews, which has made deserts of many of the older churches, is, we believe, on the decline. An active rector can generally manage to awaken public sentiment enough to induce the mere formal owners of those vast, square, green-baize-covered structures to give way to the necessities of the parish; and if, in so good a cause, he falls back on the 'free and open' principle, we have no quarrel with him. But when the poor attend, and are sufficiently and comfortably provided for, it is absurd to preach a crusade against rents which are established, paid without grudging, and urgently required.

Discarding pew rents, the advocates of the modern principle hope to find a substitute in the offertory. Accordingly there came forth at Manchester, in true High-Church style, a long essay to prove the antiquity and orthodoxy of a weekly collection, and especially the difficult point that it would be lawful to devote a part of its proceeds to the support of the clergy. Instances of the great success of the new mode were quoted. All

new modes succeed more or less under their first preachers. The offertory is a High-Church badge, and plenty of respectable people will support it. But we greatly doubt whether the Church congregations have been sufficiently trained in habits of liberality, to render it safe to rely upon their perseverance in weekly contribution. It pays in some cases in the Free Church of Scotland; but the ministers' support, coming from a central fund, is not dependent on its fluctuations. The Wesleyans collect money with great frequency; but the allowances of their ministers are met by the stated and registered contributions of the members. If a congregation is charged with providing for its clergy, it is hardly wise to rest upon collections only: even the Congregationalists do not push matters so far. It was amusing to hear a gentleman maintain before the Congress that the offertory was not a concession to the voluntary principle, because the law of God commanded all to contribute who could. The right way to abolish pew-rents, as was pointed out to all enthusiasts, is to procure a sufficient endowment; and we are convinced that it is not a wise course to throw the stipends of the clergy mainly upon the momentary caprice of their congregations. At least there should be laid upon them the onus and odium of a formal withdrawal.

We have glanced briefly at the principal subjects discussed at the Manchester Congress, following rather the course of its debates, than the wider view which might have been presented of the whole condition of the Church of England. Peace, no doubt, required that the more exciting party topics of the day should be lightly touched upon. Church rates almost escaped notice. The Prayer Book stands as it did. *Essays and Reviews* appeared but incidentally. The aspect of the meeting was towards every-day work. An exception must be made as to the Irish Church, whose position occupied an afternoon's desultory talk: but this and one or two papers referring to the Colonies we have omitted, as beyond the scheme of our remarks. We have endeavoured to discuss the points raised without bigotry on the one hand, or envy on the other; to maintain a strong and yet a broad view of the rights and duties of the Christian Church; and to point out with equal candour and sympathy the shortcomings and the virtues of the clergy, and of the institutions which it is their business to work. And while we criticise with unsparing freedom the omissions as well as the active faults displayed at their Congress, we agree at least in one thing,—that the Church of

England is to be dealt with as a powerful engine, capable of vast effort, to be amended, reformed, directed aright; but unworthy either to be destroyed by the open hostility or impeded by the secret jealousy of her fellow-workers in the field of Christian labour.

- ART. III.—1. *Heaven our Home*. Sixtieth Thousand. Edinburgh: Nimmo. 1863.
 2. *Meet for Heaven*. Twenty-third Thousand. Edinburgh: Nimmo. 1863.
 3. *Life in Heaven*. Fifteenth Thousand. Edinburgh: Nimmo. 1863.

It is difficult to do justice to the volumes at the head of this paper. The subjects of which they treat are the loftiest that can engage our thought; the books themselves are beneath review. To write in a tone which befits at once these sublime topics and the professed exposition of them here given, will demand a flexible pen. For the themes set forth in the title-page we have a profound reverence; for the style of treatment they receive in these volumes, we have an equally profound contempt. It is our purpose that the literary disgust excited by the drivellings of the author shall in no wise tinge our treatment of those high questions which he would fain discuss; and, on the other side, we intend that the respect due to subjects of such gravity shall not stand in the way of strict justice being rendered to the anonymous writer of these three volumes.

It is important to the success of a young author that his book be introduced to the public with a flourish of trumpets. It matters not so much who blows the trumpet, as that it is blown loudly. The majority of readers are unaware of the relative value of criticism, as it comes from this source or from that. When they invest three-and-sixpence in a new book, they do not take time to consider whose opinion it is that they act upon. It may be the critique of a leading Quarterly, or it may be a third-rate provincial newspaper pronouncing judgment; but if a book is said to 'exceed anything we ever read in boldness of conception, startling minuteness of delineation, and originality of illustration,' its fame is made—and also the writer's fortune. It was the happiness of the unknown author of these volumes to awake one morning and find himself renowned. An attractive title and an applauding press caused

the book to sell rapidly. If, at Christmas tide, one friend wished to present to another a religious book, what so appropriate as this, which is neither too large nor too small, neatly got up and well bound and loudly praised, and bearing as its title, *Heaven our Home*? The book sold by tens of thousands, not for what it was, but because of what it was said to be.

The author has been equally fortunate in the critics who have given judgment upon the second and third volumes, as they have appeared in quick succession. Commendation the most unqualified, and applause the most exuberant, poured forth from the press. Several editions were speedily bought up; and the aggregate sales of the three volumes have been nearly a hundred thousand. We shall examine these popular books, take them somewhat to pieces, give our readers a fair account of what they are made of, and at the same time indicate our own views upon the questions thus brought under discussion.

In the first volume our anonymous friend is a long time in getting to his subject. We are told that heaven is a great many things before we reach the point—*Heaven our Home*. It is a locality, it is Eden, it is Canaan, it is a temple, and, lastly, it is a home. In a home there will be conversation; and on this principle the author proceeds to fabricate dialogues between David and Jonathan, and others; and these conversations illustrate the 'communion of saints in heaven.' We dwell upon this portion of the volume the rather because, on the showing of an impartial reviewer, it abounds with 'charming pictures of heavenly bliss, founded upon undeniable authority, and described with the pen of a dramatist, which cannot fail to elevate the soul as well as to delight the imagination.'

We are introduced first to Adam and Eve.

'Image then, with me, my reader, yon venerable pair; they are walking alone, and loitering, with placid contemplation, among gorgeous amaranths. These are Adam and Eve. You may hear these two venerable fountains, from which the great stream of the human family is still flowing, and will continue to flow, till the river is lost in the ocean of glory, giving expression to two anxious wishes.'

We doubt whether it is dramatic to represent fountains as giving expression to anything but water; and the authority which states that the river of the human family is to be lost in the ocean of glory is far from undeniable. This might be set down as a slip of the pen, but on the same page it is said that our first parents see their children's children, even one

hundred and sixty generations, at last rejoicing before them. Now, in the first place, we cannot make so many generations anywhere. Inspired historians count rather over sixty from Adam to Christ; and it is contrary to all ordinary rules of reckoning to calculate a hundred generations in eighteen hundred years. If our first parents can see one hundred and sixty generations, it is more than we can do; but that they should see them all in heaven is equally astonishing and gratifying. We suppose this is a new figure of speech in which the whole is put for a part.

Jacob and Rachel come next on the stage, and recite their autobiography. Speaking of the morning when he left home, Jacob says, 'My mother came with me a short distance out from our dwelling, shook me by the hand, and, bursting into tears, commended me to the keeping and guidance of my covenant God.' Imagine Rebekah doing that! With this sort of stuff four pages are filled; and then Rachel 'reciprocates' in the same style, and at almost equal length, dwelling with special fulness and unction upon the circumstances of her departure.

'I looked, in my state of feeble exhaustion, upon the lovely face of our new-born babe, and wept at the thought that I was so soon to be taken from you and from him, and that our little darling was, alas! so soon to be deprived of all the kindly but nameless attentions of a mother's love! What a crush came down upon my heart, what a blight descended upon my earthly prospects, when I heard your voice beside me, and speaking to me in tones of love!'

We should be glad to learn on what principle the loving voice of a husband crushes the heart of his wife, and blights her prospects.

David and Jonathan are next called upon to speak. David is made to say, that he thought Nathan's elocution beautiful, and he fully believed that, but for his sins, the Psalms would never have been written. The prophet's elocution might be beautiful; it is certain that the author makes David's composition clumsy and his grammar intolerable. Referring to the Psalms which he wrote, David says, 'And what a solace *has* been to me my spiritual outpourings!' This is a full and complete sentence; and who, save the author, can conceive such sentiment and syntax coming from the lips of the king of Israel? Jonathan admits that he was born very proud, and had he worn the crown which his father wore, it would have cost him the price of his soul. Of course, Mary, the mother of Jesus, professes herself a staunch Protestant, and reads the Pope a lecture on Mariolatry. Paul is a Calvinist, and likens

himself to the petrel; and 'it is not difficult to figure the answer of Onesimus,' who meekly assents to all that the apostle says concerning sovereignty and election. After the death of her brother, Mary 'thought the pale moon in the sky was sick with grief, and that the stars were silently weeping over the desolation of our home;' and from 'Martha's reciprocating views' we learn that, for some years, it was her private opinion that 'the world would necessarily stand still, and the sun would cease his journey through the sky, and the moon and stars would not remain upon their watch-towers, if I was not panting, and sweating, and hurrying to and fro in the performance of duty, and in carrying forward my domestic arrangements.'

The author thinks that the spirits of just men made perfect know much of what is going on in the world. We are of opinion that if these ancient worthies are aware of the liberties taken with them in these volumes, and of the nonsense put into their lips, they will have something to say to our anonymous friend in the spirit world—if he and they should chance to meet.

Our readers will decide for themselves upon the correctness of the critique which we have quoted. Jacob says to his wife, 'O Rachel, the ways of God with His people in the world are truly wonderful, and often mysterious:' and this is given as an example of the 'communion of saints in heaven.' Mary says to her brother, 'O Lazarus, I recollect well what a blight came over my heart, when I looked upon you breathing with difficulty, and the perspiration in cold drops falling from your pallid brow!' Verily, these are 'charming pictures,' 'founded upon undeniable authority,' of course; and who can be so fastidious as to deny that the author's pen is 'the pen of the dramatist?' These are the descriptions 'which cannot fail to elevate the soul, as well as to delight the imagination:' the soul that such trash elevates must be very low, and the imagination very rude that such twaddle delights.

The second part of *Heaven our Home* consists of an essay upon the 'Recognition of Friends in Heaven.' It would seem that the chief objectors to a doctrine so reasonable are women who have been the wives, in succession, of the same husband.

'Were a first wife to meet and recognise the second, she would scarcely be able to look with heavenly love upon her successor; she would feel that she was not merely soon forgotten, but that her memory was injured by her husband's taking another to her bed; and to avoid this, to them, disagreeable meeting and recognition, such individuals take refuge in an entire disbelief of the doctrine.'

We marvel that the author does not give us a recognition scene between Jacob, Leah, and Rachel. This would furnish a fair field for the exercise of his dramatic powers. For some reason, he shuns the difficulty. Jacob deems Leah divorced, and he and Rachel studiously avoid all 'recognition' of the unfortunate Leah.

On the general question of recognition, the conclusions of the author are sound; but with the process of proof we do not agree. 'Analogy proves recognition;' as we understand analogy, it does not *prove* anything. Again, 'Believers at their death enter heaven publicly and triumphantly; and this must be the source of recognition.' If by 'heaven' is meant the final home of good people after the resurrection, and the present abode of the Man Christ Jesus, then we say, that believers do not at their death enter heaven at all, either publicly or privately. 'It is, indeed, very generally supposed that the souls of good men, as soon as they are discharged from the body, go directly to heaven; but this opinion has not the least foundation in the oracles of God. On the contrary, our Lord said to Mary, after the resurrection, "Touch Me not, for I am not yet ascended to My Father" in heaven; but He had been in Paradise, according to His promise to the penitent thief: hence it is plain that Paradise is not heaven. Paradise is indeed—if we may be allowed the expression—the ante-chamber of heaven, where the souls of the righteous remain till, after the general judgment, they are received into glory.' (Wesley.) This is strictly scriptural; the contrary view, held by the author of these volumes, is utterly unscriptural. As a further argument in favour of recognition, he says, 'Death to the believer is his coronation.' As explained by the context, the meaning of this curious sentence is, a believer is crowned the same day that he dies. The Scriptures do not teach any such thing; but, on the contrary, St. Paul teaches that it is not until the day of judgment that a Christian will receive his crown.

In these volumes it is taken for granted that there is no intermediate state or place. We doubt whether such an idea ever entered the author's mind; it is certain that he does not make the remotest reference to it. His opinion is, that the soul of a believer goes straight to the very place it will occupy after the resurrection, and that a good man gets at once his crown, his throne, his kingdom. This is affirmed; but, for the best of reasons, it is not proved. And so uniformly are these books written upon this assumption, that, if they were to be re-written on a scriptural theory, scarcely a page would be left undisturbed. As to the condition of human souls between the

hour of death and the day of judgment, the author's views are contrary to the word of God, and misleading to all who accept his fancies for sober truth. Again and again he convicts himself of error by quoting texts which overturn his theory; but he does not appreciate the adverse bearing of such and such a scripture: 'it hath set him on fire round about, yet he knew not; and it burned him, yet he laid it not to heart.' In discussing the subjects of these volumes, he is frequently brought face to face with the fact of an intermediate state; but his eyes are holden, so that he perceives it not.

The first volume sold well, and a second soon appeared. It must have something to do with heaven, and so it was entitled, *Meet for Heaven*. In this, the author 'attempts to give a description of the state of the children of God who are already glorified, viewed chiefly in their individual exaltation and personal glory.' This is one of two subjects indicated in the preface; and, in professing to discuss this theme, the writer fills more than two hundred pages, whilst all that is really said on the subject occupies just five-and-twenty. The earlier portion of the volume is devoted to a 'notice of what it is—a state of grace upon earth—that gives us the preparation to join their exalted ranks.'

In expounding a state of grace, the author gives two chapters on 'grace objectively considered,' a third upon 'the gracious union betwixt Christ in heaven and those in a state of grace,' and two more on 'grace subjectively considered.' And here we are to expect something original.

'The general subject of preaching is grace considered objectively. Some writers and preachers occasionally refer to the signs and evidences bespeaking the soul to be in a state of grace; but the portrait of a state of grace, the delineation of the soul in that state, so as to make the description a mirror in which Christians might see reflected their own gracious condition, has scarcely ever been done. This has arisen, I believe, from the difficulty of the task; for there is a difficulty in describing to the religious world what constitutes a state of grace.'

Seven facts are set forth to prove how very difficult it is 'to give to the religious public a portrait-description of a state of grace.' As a specimen of the author's facts, we quote the first of the seven: 'The Bible does not profess to describe what a state of grace is; it merely, in a few passages, incidentally refers to it.' After this there are four ways indicated in which alone it is possible to describe a state of grace—three wrong, and one right; 'the exhibition of the life of the Lord Jesus upon earth is the only safe and infallible way to show us what a

state of grace is.' We think that we are now come to the subject of the book; the sixth chapter is reached, and the author is surely going to tell us what it is to be 'meet for heaven.' Nothing of the sort. He has two important distinctions to notice: 'betwixt a state of grace and the soul's transition out of a state of nature into it,' and 'betwixt a Christian's internal experience of a state of grace and its outward manifestation.' The former distinction is thus lucidly stated:—

'Awakening to a sense of danger, conviction of sin, conversion, or turning to God in Christ Jesus, justification, adoption, regeneration, repentance, faith in its first act of lifting the newly-opened eye in search of a Saviour, are not, properly speaking, a state of grace, but so many steps by which an individual passes into it.'

This is confusion run wild, and we leave our readers to reconcile this inimitable proposition with Holy Scripture as best they can.

We come at last to the pith of the question, and reasonably look for an exposition of the earthly life of the Lord Jesus, so far as that life is an example to us. But instead of this, the author dwells upon those manifestations of the love of Christ which pass at once knowledge and imitation. In giving us an 'inventory' of the sacrifices which He made for us, the writer quotes at length ten verses out of the book of Proverbs, three out of the Lamentations of Jeremiah, four out of the second Psalm, and five from the Gospel according to St. Matthew. Of course, when a book is to be made, quotations on this scale are very helpful. On the same principle, the old story about an infant stolen by an eagle and rescued by its mother is reproduced in full to illustrate 'the nature of Christ's love to us.' The author goes on to say, 'There is in the life of Christ very varying emotions and feelings; and you who are in a state of grace must expect this to be your portion.' In support of this ungrammatical statement, he quotes Luke x. 21-24; and adds, 'At another time the Lord Jesus is dissolved into tears. This is a description of the scene of bereavement that occurred at the tomb of Lazarus,'—we thought the scene of bereavement occurred at the death-bed of Lazarus,—and then follows a quotation ending with, 'Jesus wept;' and a second which closes with the memorable appeal, 'O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from Me!' One would like to know how these illustrations do at all bear upon the argument. The former is too low; the latter is too high. Sorrow occasioned by the death of a friend is no manifestation of a state of grace. Bad men are bereaved; bad men feel their bereavement. As to

the agony of Gethsemane, that was peculiar to the Lord Jesus as the Redeemer of men. He trod the winepress alone. His disciples must ever be in relation to Him where the chosen three were in the garden—at a distance; witnesses, it may be, of His agony and bloody sweat, but not partakers of His expiatory sufferings. In selecting from 'Christ's life on earth' sorrows the like of which those in 'a state of grace' may expect, the author is most unfortunate. With such a variety of facts to choose from, and in which believers do know 'the fellowship of His sufferings,' it is passing strange that he should visit only the grave of Lazarus, the garden of Gethsemane, and the cross itself.

He seems not to recognise in the sufferings and death of Christ anything peculiar. He says, 'In Christ's death you see how you who are His followers should resign your immortal spirits into the hands of your God.' Under this heading, we are shocked by a coarse 'sensation' description of the crucifixion. Some of the expressions we dare not transcribe. Then comes a homily addressed to the dying. The author's readiness to advise all sorts and conditions of men is surprising. Sick men and slaves, prisoners for crime and prisoners for debt, the bereaved and the dying, all come in for an address. His intention, of course, is good. These persons need comfort and counsel; but it is not likely that the considerations here set forth will reach them. As a rule, slaves do not buy three-and-sixpenny books; there is not much likelihood that an African-born Negro in the Southern States will ever read *Heaven our Home*; and the chances are that the unctuous 'address to a slave' will not reach its destination. The same uncertainty waits upon the exhortation dedicated to one who is 'a prisoner through the commission of some particular crime, or the contraction of debt, or by becoming surety for a friend.' As to the manifold addresses presented to the sick and the dying, it is well that they are intercepted; the instances are rare in which sermons so poor and prosy would not do more harm than good. The author then enumerates 'certain effects not necessarily flowing from a state of grace.' These are five in number. Hear the first:—

'A state of grace in the soul does not remove all doubts about our acceptance with God. He who never doubted, never believed. Doubts, then, about our personal acceptance by God, is not an evidence that we are not in a state of grace, but a proof of how difficult a thing it is to reach the knowledge of the great truth, that our names are in the Book of Life. If sanctification were completed the moment we enter, by the regeneration of our soul,

into a state of grace, in that case our perfect holiness in thought, and word, and action, would at once be the evidence to us that we are in acceptance, and safe for ever. But sanctification is a work, and therefore progressive; and so also is the knowledge that leads to salvation.'

The writer of this paragraph is a subtle reasoner—too subtle to be appreciated by readers whose sense is common. He sees a connexion between facts that is not clear to others. It may be true that he who never doubted, never believed; but what that has to do with the following sentence, introduced as an illustration, we do not see. Then he argues from perfect holiness to a knowledge of personal acceptance. If we attained the former, we should, as a consequence, possess the latter. This is indeed putting the cart before the horse. It will be time enough to refute such reasoning when the author can produce a man who has attained to the state of grace here defined in the absence of a knowledge of his personal acceptance. The holiness which he thinks necessary to convince us that we are in the favour of God is itself a fruit of such a persuasion of God's fatherly love. An author who has written largely upon 'a state of grace' puts the matter thus: 'We must be holy of heart, and holy in life, before we can be conscious that we are so; but we must love God before we can be holy at all—this being the root of all holiness: now we cannot love God till we know that He loves us; and we cannot know His pardoning love to us till His Spirit witnesses it to our spirit.' This is sound divinity and true philosophy; and when next the author of *Meet for Heaven* is pressed by the 'difficulty of giving a portrait-description of a state of grace,' we commend to him the series of fifty-three sermons from which this extract is made. He will find that one who was an accurate scholar and sound logician has really 'described to the religious world what constitutes a state of grace.'

The evidence that we are 'in acceptance' proves also that we are 'safe for ever.' The witness of our personal acceptance with God is long in coming; we must wait patiently; but when the witness does come, there is double duty to perform. According to the author, this witness must not only depose that our name is in the book of life, but add that it shall never be taken out. It is not enough to prove that we are saved now; it must also be shown to our satisfaction that we are safe for ever. Well, to those good people who are content to wait so long for the evidence of their acceptance, it is not in our heart to grudge a twofold testimony when it does come; only, the connexion between the two facts is assumed, not proved. The author

does not make it clear how it is that a state of heart which proves our acceptance with God now, proves also that we are safe for all time to come. For his own credit, it is quite as well that he does not try.

'Sanctification is a work, and therefore progressive.' What means this 'therefore?' Are all works progressive? Might we not as well say that justification is a work, and therefore progressive? 'And so also is the knowledge that leads to salvation.' Of course it is; but the knowledge of which the author is now speaking is the knowledge of salvation—as he puts it, 'the knowledge that our names are in the book of life.' Between this knowledge and the knowledge that leads to salvation there is a wide difference, and why put one for the other? It is easier to prove the 'knowledge that leads to salvation' progressive than the 'knowledge of salvation.' The former no one doubts; the latter none can prove. Did the writer perceive this, and purposely change the phrase that so his doctrine might pass unchallenged? Or did he unwittingly write 'the knowledge that leads to salvation,' when he meant 'the knowledge of salvation?' If the latter, it is inexcusable carelessness; if the former, it is—we do not choose to say what.

'Again, absolute perfection in the moralities of life is not effected all at once when we enter a state of grace. The best man who ever lived has his sins; but these, if you are led to feel a sincere sorrow over them, and to struggle against their recurrence, *is* no proof that you are not in the way of salvation. Yet, too many of them, especially if signalling frequent relapses into sin, should awaken in your mind the feelings of a careful jealousy, lest the root of the tree of life be not yet in your heart, and you may not be in a state of grace at all.'

The grammar, the composition, the theology of this paragraph are equally noteworthy. The author excels in ambiguities. 'The best man who ever lived has his sins.' It is highly probable that the best man who ever lived is not living now, and we cannot say of a departed saint that he has his sins; he had them once, but at the latest, and on the author's own showing, he would get rid of them when he died. Then the phrase 'has his sins' is ambiguous. If it be meant that he sins, why not say so? And if this be not meant, why use words that may carry such a meaning? But these sins that he 'has *is* no proof that he is not in the way of salvation, provided he struggles against their recurrence.' 'Not in the way of salvation;' what does this mean? Why does the author at every turn choose phrases that may signify much or little as may be most convenient? If the meaning is that such a

person is in the way that leads to salvation, the statement may be true; it is not until a man is regenerate and born again that he is endued with mastery over all sin. But if the meaning is that one who sins is saved, it is simply untrue. 'Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin.' 'He that committeth sin is of the devil.' 'Yet too many of them'—for 'them' read 'sins,' and the sentence stands,—'Yet too many sins, especially if signalling frequent relapses into sin,' should compel us to doubt our acceptance. We leave our readers to unravel this choice specimen of the author's composition.

It is questionable whether he is to be blamed for perpetrating such theological blunders as abound in this volume. We do not think that he means to say what is anti-scriptural. The fact is, he lacks the most ordinary capacity for discussing theological questions. He betrays surprising ignorance of the meaning of words, or else he is unaccountably careless in using them. Frequently, in a single sentence, the ground is changed, and a supplementary clause is added which relates to something quite different. It may be that he is justly afraid of committing himself to a close definition; it is certain that, in taking position, he generally leaves a loop-hole through which he may retreat when convenient.

The title of the second volume is *Meet for Heaven*; and the principle to be therein discussed is set forth with great prominence as 'a state of grace on earth the only preparation for a state of glory in heaven.' This is the advertisement of the book, and we expect something answerable to this lofty and lucid programme. Having been told beforehand that 'heaven is our home,' we look now for directions how to reach it. We wish to know in what the meetness consists, and on what conditions it is to be obtained. The reader will not learn much about the meetness, and still less about how it is to be got. The author makes marvellous difficulties in describing a state of grace; if we were to infer that it is as difficult to get into a state of grace as to describe it, the attempt to become meet for heaven would be given up in despair. A chapter might profitably have been devoted to inquirers after the path of life. To many readers a hand-post, pointing out the nearest way into a state of grace, would have been welcome. We had the more right to expect this, inasmuch as the author is not unused to hortatory digressions. He thinks himself specially called to admonish and instruct ministers; and who can tell but they need it? A few expository pages addressed to 'the ignorant and them that are out of the way' would have done something

towards giving the book a practical aim, and redeeming it from insipidity.

So far as the contents of a volume are indicated by the title, *Meet for Heaven* ends at page 111. The discussion is finished; there is nothing more to be said; but there are one hundred and sixty pages to be filled up. To some authors this would be a difficulty; not so to the author of these volumes. He is skilful in book-making; and as he has no more to say about a state of grace, he gives four chapters upon a state of glory. It is true that he had written a book on the subject, and described heaven at great length; true that his present avowed business is to show in what a meetness for heaven consists: but that is nothing: some things are worth saying twice, and this is the author's judgment as to many things he had told us in *Heaven our Home*.

In the course of these chapters, we have a full and particular account of the translation of Enoch. The author admits that 'the Bible has not minutely revealed the exact circumstances in which Enoch bade adieu to earth:' the Bible does not give the remotest hint, much less minutely reveal the exact circumstances: 'still,' says the undaunted writer, 'I can figure to myself the uprising to heaven of this man of God, and the commingled feelings and emotions that must have streamed through his soul whilst passing upwards from a state of grace to enter upon a state of glory.' We are informed that Enoch's journey from earth to heaven 'must have been something like Columbus's first voyage across the Atlantic.' This is not at all an encouraging comparison by which to describe and make plain our journey from this world to another. The author, however, seems in his element on the billow and amidst the foam; and probably he thinks that others have the same liking for salt water. At length, Enoch reaches the farther shore of 'the great ocean of space,' and lands safely. What room there would be for landing when he has left all space behind him, one can scarcely see; but Enoch gets over this difficulty, 'and heaven, in all its splendour, with its crowded courts, and light, and praise, bursts upon his view. Have you walked beneath a cloudy sky in a moonless and starless night, reached your home after finishing a fatiguing journey, and felt the effect of the first burst of light upon your eye-balls from luminous globes in your lobby, and through the rooms of your house? Yet how little, by such experiences, can you realise Enoch's advent into heaven!' None but the veriest novice would venture to trifle with the religious public by suggesting such an illustration.

The most remarkable portion of the book consists of thirteen 'analogies betwixt a state of grace upon earth and a state of glory in heaven.' Concerning these the author says, 'I have done, in a higher province, what Butler, in his celebrated *Analogy*, has done in a lower.' This is the estimate which he forms of his own work. He places himself side by side with the renowned analogician, likens his own labours to those of the bishop, and claims for his 'thirteen analogies between a state of grace and a state of glory' a place on the same shelf with Butler's *Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed, to the Constitution and Course of Nature*. He who prefers such a claim is no common man. His assurance or his ability must be of no ordinary magnitude. Let us see which it is.

The first analogy is thus stated: 'The transition into a state of glory, as well as into a state of grace, generally takes place in circumstances of sorrow.' Not always; a few are favoured, and pass into a state of grace without 'suffering those spiritual tremblings which others endure; insensibly and imperceptibly they pass into a state of covenant favour with God.' In the same way, Enoch and Elijah passed into another world without dying. But on both sides, these are the exceptions. The rule is,—before men rejoice in the Lord, they must sorrow after a godly sort; and before believers taste the fullness of joy that is at God's right hand, they must generally sicken and always die. These facts lie on the surface, yet the author thinks such views 'somewhat philosophical and novel.' What strikes us as novel is the amount of illustration used in connexion with a thought so threadbare. The thing is so clear, that to state it in simple words seems enough; but in his judgment the idea is so profoundly philosophical that it needs twenty pages of illustration to make it plain to simple souls.

The first scene is a shipwreck; hundreds of people, of all sorts and conditions, are lost; and all this to show that good men suffer and die. The second, third, and fourth, are ordinary death-beds; a little girl, whom death finds in a garret, a married man, who dies in a princely mansion, and a young scapegrace, who is saved as by fire. The fifth scene is the general deluge, and the sixth is the slaying of the firstborn in Egypt on the night of the Passover. In order to show that believers are generally taken away in circumstances of sorrow, the author relates at full length the sorrows of antediluvians and Egyptians who were in no sense believers. These narratives are as inappropriate as could well be quoted. They

prove nothing, and illustrate nothing. Death by drowning is painful to a sinner; therefore a saint suffers at the last hour. The firstborn in Egypt were suddenly smitten down at midnight; therefore the young people of Great Britain who waste away in consumption suffer much from weakness and weariness. On this principle of filling up pages by the score with what has nothing to do with the subject, a cart-load of books might soon be written; but there are books that perish with the using.

We give the sixth and ninth of these famous analogies without note or comment, save that, as in all other quotations, the construction and syntax are the author's own.

'The life of those who are in a state of grace upon earth is a holy activity in the ways of God—analogy countenances the view that the life of those who are in a state of glory is the same. Difference of selective affinities and tastes *exist* in God's children who are in a state of grace—there may be the same in a state of glory.'

These chapters furnish several rare examples of confused composition. 'If the means of grace be instituted by God, you are lying, who profess to be His, under the infinite obligation of His Divine authority to observe them.' The reader feels the clause, 'You are lying,' a reflection upon his own truthfulness: it is a construction which betokens great carelessness in the writer. Speaking of the relationships of domestic life, he says, 'These are the fair and lovely spectacles of family ties by which we are now united,'—so that we are united by spectacles,—but relentless death soon steps in, and cruelly and mercilessly breaks them up'—spectacles may be broken up, but ties are broken. 'If this supposition which I have ventured to make, giving utterance to the voice of analogy, be true, then our death-chamber and our uprising into heaven, who are believers in Jesus, will not be to us such a desolate and solitary scene in our march onwards to a glorious immortality, as too many Christians paint it in their imaginings.' It was after reading such sentences,—and there are hundreds like these,—that a reviewer applauded this volume for its 'closeness of reasoning, originality of conception, and rare flow of language.' We cannot think the critic was serious when he wrote down these as the characteristics of the book, any more than the author could be serious when he said, 'I have done, in a higher province, what Butler, in his celebrated *Analogy*, has done in a lower.'

The title of the third volume is *Life in Heaven*. In one

respect we note a real improvement upon the first and second ; it is not so disfigured by the needless and constant use of italics. In those volumes we count on many a page six, eight, or ten words or parts of sentences in italics ; on one page we observe fourteen. To an educated eye this is offensive. An author who besprinkles his pages with single words or clauses in italics must imagine that he is frequently saying very extraordinary things ; or he is conscious that his ordinary style is confused and needs adventitious help of this sort to make himself understood ; or he lacks taste. 'We will thus be *led* to see the absolute necessity of being in a state of grace *here*, that we may at death enter upon a state of glory *yonder*.' What need there is for the use of italics three times in this plain sentence, we cannot tell ; yet this sentence is a specimen of thousands. In this respect the third volume is less disfigured than its two predecessors ; and it is a relief to find anything that it is possible to commend.

Life in Heaven is advertised as a companion volume to *Heaven our Home* and *Meet for Heaven* ; it would have been nearer the truth to announce it as a duplicate volume. We have searched for what would justify its author in calling it a companion volume—in the sense of being one of a series in which some kindred yet separate topic is discussed ; but we search in vain. In other senses, it is a companion volume ; it is marked by the same blemishes—italics excepted, it treats of the same subjects, and it is sold at the same price. In the advertisement we are further told that *Life in Heaven* will embrace a subject of very great interest which is not included in the two previous volumes. We have looked in vain for anything answerable to this announcement. What the 'subject' referred to is, we cannot even guess.

The eighteenth chapter begins thus : 'There is such a thing as life in heaven.' This is the first we hear of what is professedly the subject of the book. We undertake to say that were a man to read with care the first hundred and ninety-nine pages, and then be asked to guess the title of the book he was reading, he would not hit upon *Life in Heaven*.

The first two chapters are clearly an old sermon, and not a bad one, on 2 Peter iii. 10–12. The preacher stoutly maintains that dissolution is destruction. The sun is to 'lie down in the grave of the original nothingness out of which he arose ;' the moon is simply to 'disappear ;' the stars are to 'strew the plains of annihilation ;' and the earth is to 'melt, dissolve, and disappear like snow from one of its mountain summits when the sudden thaw descends upon it.'

The fourth chapter is on 'Heaven as the Home of God's Children, and Faith's Glimpse into it,' being a repetition of part of the sixth chapter of *Heaven our Home*. Then follow five chapters in which there is not the remotest allusion to *Life in Heaven*. They consist simply of a series of death-scenes, headed page after page, 'Nearing Home,' 'The Way Home,' 'Reaching Home:' and all this is surely life on earth, not life in heaven. In all reason, the right place for these chapters—and for the first two on 'Earth not our Home'—would be in the former part of the volume on *Heaven our Home*. In dealing with that subject, it might have been profitable to show that earth cannot long yield a home, and a few examples of good people reaching home might have been introduced. But in a book professing to expound *Life in Heaven*, all this is out of place. We want to know whatever devout meditation might tell us about the state of the departed; and, instead of this, we are taken hither and thither to see persons die, and hear some of them make long speeches—such speeches as surely dying men never made. The author describes at length the death of Moses, of Jacob, of the penitent malefactor, of Lazarus the beggar, and of Stephen. Then follow other death-bed experiences, and we cannot say much for the selection. One dying man says, 'Turn, my beloved, and be thou like to a roe or to a young hart upon the mountains of Bether..... I long for the fragrancy of the spiced wine. Stay me with flagons; comfort me with apples, for I am sick of love.' No doubt this is authentic; but we question the taste that makes such quotations from religious biography. The author, however, has a special liking for 'the song of songs which is Solomon's.' He is on intimate terms with a person whom he calls the 'mystic spouse,' and to whom he introduces his readers five times in the first two volumes. For the 'mystic spouse' herself we entertain a high regard; but we would rather encounter the phrase not quite so often.

In the two chapters on 'The Way Home,' the author repeats a part of what was said in working out the first analogy in *Meet for Heaven*, to the effect that 'God's children enter heaven through the pathway of a temporal death.' The truth is soon written; and, in connexion with the aforementioned analogy, it has been illustrated to death already. But the author is ingenious in finding out all that can be said about a subject. The way home, *as it is*, has been described at a wearisome length; and now he imagines the way home *as it might have been*. This is a happy thought, and he makes the most of it. Death-scenes begin to be scarce, but translation-

scenes can be multiplied at will; change and variety will be secured, and meantime the book will grow; and on these grounds the author tries his hand at translating. The first person whom he translates is the reader's mother, the second is his own daughter; and the entire description gives one the idea of a group of persons assembled to watch the ascent of a balloon. In the former case, the ascension takes place from the door-step, and at length 'your mother becomes in your view smaller and smaller, till at last she dwindles into the form of a small contracting cloudlet upon the face of the clear, high, and seemingly far-distant sky.' But do not be uneasy; for 'the glorious hosts of heaven, who look forth upon her from the door-steps of eternity, watch her ascent in a flutter of emotional gladness.' The author's child goes up from the court near the front door; and as she rises, 'her golden ringlets floating in many a graceful curl upon the air, are like a rainbow of beauty throwing its arch of loveliness around her neck.' His account of the imaginary ascension of his own 'fair child, whose eyes are like two morning stars quietly shining out from a pure, cloudless sky, when beheld in Italian climes,' covers exactly six pages; and the sentimentality of the description is absolutely sickening.

Against all this rigmarole we solemnly protest. It is neither more nor less than a gross case of book-making. Between these ascension-scenes and the declared subject of this volume there is no connexion whatever, and several chapters are foisted upon the reader under false pretences. When we buy a book entitled *Life in Heaven*, we justly expect to be instructed upon that specific subject; we claim that the writer of a book, thus advertised, should give us his ripest thoughts on this particular theme. The author of this volume was not bound to publish a book on *Life in Heaven*; it was his own act and deed when for the third time within three years he rushed into print. But, when he did announce a third volume, bearing this title, he engaged to tell the religious public what he knew about *Life in Heaven*. He may have done this; but if the little he has told us in the later chapters is all he knew on that subject, he ought not to have attempted a three-and-sixpenny book: a threepenny pamphlet would 'carry all he knew.' To give us two hundred pages, to begin with, on other topics is too bad.

Then these are, for the most part, topics upon which we have heard too much already. In the previous volumes we were sickened with elaborate descriptions of sick-beds and last hours; of these we count half a score; and in opening this volume we supposed that death-scenes would form no part of

Life in Heaven. But the author can 'do' them to any extent, and in the first eighty pages of this book we have ten more. Then, as a little variety, we have the two ascension-scenes. He says, 'O, I can conceive' all this; no doubt, and very much more; but it is time he knew that men who think do not care to read all that he can conceive.

We might hope that we shall not again be summoned to the 'death-couch' of Rachel or anybody else. But the author seems to gravitate naturally towards dying circumstances, and between pages 110 and 150 we have six more scenes, not of ascension, but of plain dying. Look in upon one as a specimen of all the rest. It is a wife and mother who is on her death-bed; and, as she is dying, there is put into her mouth a long speech that occupies more than two pages. As to some of the expressions, it is incredible that any one dying should use them. The whole is in bad taste, and is fitly crowned by this pretentious paragraph:—

'It is not difficult to realise that some of these, angels with the light of love upon their countenances, with the joy of heaven in their bosoms, and the glittering dew-drops of the morning of eternity upon their expanded wings, are in that chamber of death, though unseen; they have been waiting like so many affectionate nurses for the birth of a child, till that child of God is ready to rise with them, and enter upon the path that is, in their company, to conduct her up to her rest.'

We do not know so much of the angels and their habits as the author seems to do; but we should think that if they had been waiting in the room any length of time,—say, while the speech was being delivered,—they would not keep their wings expanded, but would fold them gracefully whilst they waited. We take this to be the author's private opinion; for in describing the sending forth of the destroying angel on the eve of the Passover, he says, 'In instant obedience, the heavenly messenger spreads his silvery wings upon the ethereal blue, and descends.' After a while, he alights upon Egyptian soil, and pauses a few minutes before beginning his work. 'But soon he is again in motion; he spreads his pinions of light above the unthinking and slumbering homes, and begins his death-march.' It would be a novel 'march' over the tops of houses, the angel striding from roof to roof; but we give this quotation, not to show that 'pinions' are used to 'march' with, but to make it clear that when an angel sets off on a journey, he spreads his wings: and this, of course, implies that whilst the angel rested, the said wings were folded. Our opinion is that the angels waited in the above bed-room with

folded wings; but in such a posture 'the glittering dew-drops of the morning of eternity' would have been wasted, and the author has no choice but to sacrifice the dew-drops or represent the angels as unmannerly.

The two following chapters are headed, 'The Welcome Home,' and 'The Meeting of Friends in Heaven.' The scene of such events must surely lie beyond the Jordan, and we shall now hear a little about *Life in Heaven*, though it be but the first half hour there. In this book, however, heaven is a land that is very far off—if, indeed, its distance be in proportion to the length of time the author takes to reach it. Instead of meeting in heaven, as we hoped to do, we again meet by the bed-side of the dying. Your mother dies, then your father, and so on until everybody is dead, and you feel as the man felt who said to Job, 'I only am escaped alone to tell thee.' Then follow five chapters which are, for the most part, a repetition of what we had met with in the two previous volumes. In reading *Life in Heaven*, one cannot but marvel at the coolness with which the author reproduces material already in print.

We notice a singular discrepancy between the programme advertising the contents and the contents themselves, even as set forth in the index. For instance, in the advertisement the two chapters which consist of a sermon on 2 Peter iii. 10–12 are silently ignored. The author felt that it would not do to announce a volume on *Life in Heaven*, and say that he should begin to expound the subject by proving at length that the elements shall melt with fervent heat; but the buyer feels himself deceived, for he is told that the first chapter is to be on 'Heaven, a World of Life too little realised,' and he finds the first and second are both on 'Earth, not the Home in which we are to live for ever.' Further, in the advertisement we are promised three chapters on these high themes: 'Christ's Life in Heaven the Pattern of His People's there;' 'The Life of the Glorified;' 'The Life of the Glorified viewed in its various Features—a Life of Activity, of Holiness, of Love, of Variety and Progress, of Social Intercourse.' These are advertised as the contents of chapters 11, 12, and 13. It will be seen that this is a good and bold outline; and if the author had carefully worked out these eight points, he would have put us in possession of nearly all that we can know at present concerning 'life in heaven.' The fact, however, is—he does not work them out at all. Why he does not, he best knows. It may be that, on approaching this part of the programme, he found himself unequal to the discussion of themes so high.

This supposition reflects upon the author's prudence; he ought not to advertise a book unless he is quite sure that he can write one. The only alternative is yet more damaging. We state the case thus:—When the programme was drawn out, the author either meant to fill it up, or he did not; if he did, well—and we have seen what that involves; if he did not, it is clear that the programme was drawn out and advertised only as a bait to catch purchasers.

If we judge of a book by its title, the three chapters just named would constitute the book. Even in the programme, up to this point all is plainly preparatory, and beyond it all is illustrative; so that in these chapters we look for the core and substance of the volume. It may seem incredible, yet it is true, that in the index to *Life in Heaven*, two out of these three chapters are silently omitted. The author chooses to forget that he had solemnly promised them to his readers. In the chapter on 'Christ's Life in Heaven,' we are told that His is a life of rest, of action, of holiness, of love, of variety, of intercourse; all this is crowded into four pages which are filled chiefly with verses of Scripture. But not a word is said to prove that Christ's life in heaven is the pattern of His people's there, not a word on the life of the glorified, not a word to show that theirs is a life of activity, and holiness, and love, and variety, and progress, and social intercourse. In the programme all this is plainly promised; in the book all this is wanting.

The heading of the last chapter reads, 'Social Intercourse in Heaven exemplified by various Illustrations.' The point to be illustrated is one of six which are grouped together in the programme as the subject of a single chapter, and in the book all six are left out as of no consequence; yet so capricious is the author's pen that these illustrations of a solitary idea stretch over nearly threescore and ten pages, and are subdivided into five separate chapters. They consist of fabricated conversations, supposed to take place in heaven. Isaiah and John are the first pair of 'Bible saints' who are made to do duty in filling up volume the third; then we overhear Abraham and Lazarus and Job preaching by turns an old sermon on the doctrine of a particular providence, kindly lent by the author. There are six other groups of talkers, from Moses and Elias down to Milton, Cowper, and Pollok.

All this is of a piece with certain chapters in *Heaven our Home*. It is the same thought and the same style; the only difference lies in the persons who are called upon to speak. It is surely an oversight that these conversations are not bound

up in the same volume. If they illustrate anything, they serve as well to illustrate *Heaven our Home* as *Life in Heaven*. It is difficult to see why some of these should appear in this volume, and some in that. One reason suggests itself: the first series were trumpeted forth as 'charming pictures of heavenly bliss, founded upon undeniable authority, and described with the pen of a dramatist.' When that which costs little fetches much, men are eager to do business; and, on this principle, we do not marvel that, at the first opportunity, our author tries again his dramatic pen.

The style of these volumes is peculiar. Many pet phrases illustrate the author's doctrine of 'selective affinities.' The soul of a dying man receives notice to 'flit' to heaven; and on four succeeding pages we meet with the same elegant word. 'Image' takes full work as a verb. 'Onlooking spectators' is a favourite phrase. In working out a climax the author raises some 'hallelujah acclaim;' and we listen to this 'acclaim,' seven times repeated, until we are weary to bear it. 'Whole' instead of 'all' is regularly used; we read, for instance, of 'the whole angels'—as if there were angels that were not whole and complete in their personal organization. The holy Scriptures are 'inspired vocables.' In the limits of a few pages, the phrase 'probation season' occurs five times; and in connexion with this we are told 'how delightful life would have been had our probation season been free from every kind of trial!' We meet with 'commingled' feelings and emotions two-and-twenty times; but the word which of all others the author loves the best is 'pavilion.' In these volumes are nine pavilions of space, and three of love; four of light, and one of darkness, besides seventeen others too various to classify.

Figures are used as hardly as are phrases. The author does not know when to say, It is enough. We meet with the same words and metaphors until our soul is filled with loathing. The 'pilgrim' is run off his feet. The 'emigrant' is perpetually being called off from his work to illustrate this point or that. But the 'mariner' is most in request. There are hundreds of allusions to seafaring, some brief, some lengthy; and as to nautical phraseology, it runs through every volume. We are not aware that Elijah had much to do with salt water; yet, in giving his autobiography, the prophet of Horeb has four nautical metaphors thrust into his lips within the compass of a single page. We wonder that, amongst the numerous hortatory digressions found in these volumes, there is not an address to the class of men with whose manner of life the author seems

most familiar—our common sailors. The following examples illustrate his bold use of nautical metaphors :—

‘You, my readers, are vessels built in the dockyard of the great spirit-land, launched by God Himself upon the sea of life, richly laden and freighted with the treasures of immortality; the sheeted sea around you is radiant with the gleam and the sunshine of your immortal hopes; you are gliding on with outstretched sail along the bosom of the great deep, and soon you will leave the sea of life here and cross over into the ocean of glory yonder, and there you will sail for ever in an ocean of beatitude that is bounded by no shore.’

This is a great deal for an author to promise to his ‘readers’ without respect of character; it is no wonder that such a book is read. But in a previous volume the same author had said :—

‘Sin is a storm-wind that has shivered every one of the noble vessels of humanity that has been launched from the dockyard of immortality by God Himself; and now the storm of God’s wrath is upon every child of Adam, and the rugged rocks of perdition are towering and frowning upon us from the shore of the eternity that is before us.’

Which of the two statements must we believe? We appeal from ‘Philip drunk’ in the third volume to ‘Philip sober’ in the first. The author thinks it not impossible that ‘heaven has weighed anchor, and is also under sail as well as the earth;’ he teaches, however, that in heaven there are no shipwrecks, and ‘Franklin may be even now exploring new realms of space, but the towering icebergs no longer threaten to bear down upon him, to shiver the vessel of glory in which he sails.’

He speaks of the ocean as ‘nature’s ball-room;’ yet elsewhere he says, ‘No ocean was seen, as yet, sitting in its restless chamber, with its nimble fingers upon the key-board of the rugged shore, playing its hoarse tune of praise to Him whose way is in the sea, and His footsteps in the deep waters.’ A restless chamber is a new thing; it is not usual for nimble fingers to play hoarse tunes, but for a ball-room to sit and play any sort of tune is—metaphor run mad. Again, he says, ‘Stand with me upon the sea-shore, and look towards the expanse of waters that are rolling in their growling dignity before us.’ A growling dignity is a new sort of dignity; and, no matter how angry they may be, it is not usual for waters to growl. In an improved version of the English Bible, the author would evidently have us read, ‘Let the sea growl, and the fulness thereof.’

The author’s illustrations overshadow his meaning. ‘It is thus, also, that the Christian graces in our moral nature, acted upon and developed, as the flowers that adorn the bosom of the

earth in summer, are awakened into existence, are pencilled forth in their beauty, and are evolved into the full blow of their loveliness, by being fully exposed to the shining of the summer sun.' We are of opinion that in passages like this—and their number is great—the author's style is 'evolved into the full blow' of big swelling words that mean no one knows what. 'David breathes seemingly the very atmosphere of devotion with which he is encompassed.' He has no choice; like everybody else, David is shut up to breathe the atmosphere with which he is encompassed, be it devotion or anything else. It seems to us that a man first makes his own atmosphere, and then breathes it; otherwise, he is not either to be praised or blamed. 'God, glowing with all the social affections of the Divine nature, is the centre, the all-attractively operating source of sympathetic attraction to the human.' It is a pity that men will not say what they mean.

We have already seen that the author's views of the requirements of syntax are peculiar; his choice of words is equally singular. He speaks, for instance, of 'God's disposal with us;' and thinks 'your now glorified partner is fond about you still,' and that the glorified generally are not uninterested 'so far as their brethren on earth is concerned.' In pronouncing upon a question of religious experience, he maintains that 'doubts of our acceptance with God is no unusual manifestation of a state of grace;' and in a section headed, 'A Word to Believers,' and addressed specifically to Christians, the author likens certain voices to 'the receding notes of music whilst you are in the act of leaving the ball-room.' We do not wonder that believers who frequent the ball-room have doubts of their acceptance with God.

Our author delights in pairing words. The hyphen is in great demand. Many words that had formerly seen each other in the distance only are here associated, and even tied together. We read of a 'space-annihilating invention,' of a 'presently-existing home,' of 'fellowship-walks,' and of 'dead-clothes;' of one thing that is 'long-wished-for,' and another that is 'much-to-be-desired,' of 'contracted-minded worldlings,' and of cemeteries that are 'tastefully-laid-out.' We are told of 'previously-crowded courts,' and a 'previously-benighted creation,' of 'previously-desolate souls,' of 'previously-sickened plants,' and a 'previously-agreed-upon avenue.' These are specimens; and the constant use of such epithets proves the author to be destitute of taste or wanting in industry. Educated writers do not need to resort to the practice of linking together two, three, or four words, in order to express their meaning. We should

think that in these volumes all the forms which love can take may be met with. Here are 'love-breathings' and 'love-beamings,' which lead to 'love-attentions,' seconded by 'love-pleadings;' and for others not so privileged there is a 'love-gaze,' accompanied by 'longing lookings' and 'heavenly glowings.' We look at an 'ongoing example,' and more than once we are admonished of an 'oncoming eternity;' we read of comfort 'timeously' administered, and are taught to regard the clouds as 'floating water-barrels;' we are told of an 'earthquake of anguished terror' when the sky was 'as black as if it had suddenly become a firmament of congealed ink,' and of a wealthy lady who spent too much of her income 'in a round of unmeaning partyings.'

Our author takes great liberties with the sun. On one memorable occasion, 'he was turned into darkness, as if he had swooned, and become black in the agonies of death;' and he is at the last to be 'put to bed, the bed of nothingness.' The angels have their hands full. They are 'undying courtiers in the palace of eternity;' they are 'celestial aides-de-camp;' and at the great assize they are to serve as a 'grand jury.' The author must live on intimate terms with the angels; for he informs us that there are amongst them 'complexional differences,' and that they are neither Presbyterians nor Republicans. He has no ear for melody, and no eye for metaphor. 'Love is flowing in its eternal glowings:' as a rule, that which flows does not glow; it is, moreover, in bad taste to collocate words in this way. But he delights in creating a jingle by means of participles, and so he speaks of the grace of Christ 'in its onflowings towards us,' 'in its still warm glowings through His bosom,' and 'its overflowings in His life upon earth:' all these in a few lines. This is a specimen of the author's habitual contempt for the first principles of composition. He speaks of a 'soft, dull, heavy crash,' and makes the Baptist say that 'instantly the sword fell with a crash, I heard it, and my head rolled upon the floor.' Is the author deaf? If not, he must know that it is not with a crash that a sword falls upon flesh. A crash is the reverse of soft and dull; it may sometimes be heavy.

In reading these volumes, you are put through a catechism, and asked all sorts of questions about your friends. As to your daughter,

'Did you see her grow up from infancy to girlhood, with her bright blue, laughing eyes, with her cheeks trying to outblush the tinge of the opening rose when dipped in the dew of the morning, with her golden hair in graceful ringlets parted and clustering over

her marble brow, and dangling in many a graceful curl round about her ivory neck? Did you see the laughing, romping, fawn-like girl expand before you in loveliness like the opening rose, and at last bloom into the blush and graceful timidity of the highly-accomplished, serene-countenanced, and sensitively-refined young lady? Did you see that eye that beamed upon you for years with an intelligent mildness, like a calm blue lake encircled by roses, and breathed upon by the fragrant breezes of heaven, close before you in the cold, upturned, and fixed gaze of death? The lips change in their colour from the hue of the cherry into the livid expression of a shrivelled and wasted grape?

The author may think this fine writing; it is clear that some of his critics do: but this is the kind of writing that we call 'maudlin.' These interrogations run on by the hundred, and occupy scores of pages. In *Heaven our Home* we have three pages in succession, filled with questions about one's mother; and the first reads, 'Had you a dear, dear, fond mother once, who first learned your infant lips to pray to your Father who is in heaven?' Our mothers have *taught* us many things; but it is not usual for one person to *learn* another either to pray or to sing. But let this vulgarism pass: we object to the perpetual and impertinent questioning in which the author indulges. What right has he to rake our memory in this fashion? What matters it whether or not a widower remembers the day when he fell in love? And what end does it serve to tell him that, during the marriage ceremony, 'there came the thrill of an almost unbearable emotion when, at the bidding of the man of God, she laid her hand in yours, and you pressed it gently in a tremor of delight, and you listened with an almost choking emotion of gladness to the official declaration that you had become *one*?' The marvel is that the bridegroom survived the service; he is first almost crushed, and then almost choked!

In our judgment, this interrogation and description is 'sensation' trash, and would be more in place in the pages of a novel than in a chapter on the 'Meeting of Friends in Heaven.' In the endless questioning that pervades these volumes, we have the index to a depraved literary taste, and the sign of a morbid imagination. No man of healthy mind would choose to have his deepest sorrows sent to press, or his secret anguish put into print. If we must bury our joys, let the funeral be strictly private. To us it seems little less than profane to make our dead friends lie in state, and charge a fee for the sight of them 'laid out, cold, motionless, and decayed;' to us it seems akin to covetousness to fill up a book with such pictures,

and so make merchandise of that which the very poor hold sacred.

These volumes are evidently the work of a vulgar, ignorant, and uneducated mind. A seduction story is told at great length in one volume, and is raked up in another. It is dragged in; between such a narrative and the subject of the book there is no connexion. The author goes into particulars, and spins out the imaginary story, and tells a tale that ought never to have been bound up in a volume entitled *Heaven our Home*. His conceit and dogmatism are most offensive. Ministers are in the dark; religious writers, Doddridge in particular, have missed their way; and amongst Christians generally there is 'great dimness and confusion of view.' All who object to his representations are 'captious,' and such as decline to accept his expositions of Scripture are 'scoffers.' As his books sell, his dogmatism deepens into rudeness. He breaks out, 'But don't tell me, for I do not believe it.' This may do for men wrangling in a beer-shop; but such a style of address does not become the gravity of authorship and the dignity of his theme. We note the inordinate scale on which Scripture is quoted. At times, for several pages together, fully one half is Scripture. Of course, that which is taken from the Bible is by far the best portion of these volumes; and it is well that we sustain our own views by appeals to the truth itself. But the author over-quotes. For instance, in referring to the visit which the queen of Sheba paid to Solomon, he first describes the visit in his own words, and then quotes at length the nine verses in which the inspired narrative is given. 'In every book regard the author's end.' If his end was simply to fill so many pages at the smallest cost in thought and labour, these voluminous quotations serve his purpose, and the author must be pronounced wise in his generation.

But as a religious teacher, he is utterly untrustworthy. His views of conversion are unscriptural; it is well that he sometimes flatly contradicts himself, for so he makes it clear that he is a blind guide. He says, 'Your repentance is your translation from death into life;' and he makes John the Baptist say, 'I still think that many Christian ministers in preaching the Gospel dwell too little upon repentance; it is right to insist much upon faith in the Lord Jesus as the way by which the perishing are saved; but the faith that does not result in repentance is not saving.' This is the order; first faith, and then repentance. He volunteers a statement of his own religious experience, and in it there is enough to show that his creed would make a very broad church. He even regards Simon

Peter's bitter sorrow, after denying Christ, merely as a necessary variety in his 'religious experience!'

It is clear that the unknown author of these volumes has mistaken his calling. In the republic of letters, he is astray and out of place. He shows no cause for the step he has taken, and does not manifest any sort of talent that warrants him in claiming a place amongst the goodly fellowship of religious authors. He is incapable of sustained thought, and ignorant of the meaning of words; and least of all is he equal to the discussion of such subjects as he has chosen. He lacks reverence. The way in which he speaks of God is frequently most unbecoming. The Father is more 'calm and comforting' than the moon, and more 'beautiful' than the rainbow. To an unregenerate man, 'God appears like the sun when looked at through smoked glass.' 'The Holy Spirit is the bunch of grapes which the Lord Jesus has brought out to us from heaven.' Worse than all, he professes to describe the Man Christ Jesus as He now is,—'His present personal appearance;' he quotes at length Solomon's Song, v. 10-16, and gives that as a human likeness of Him who is the brightness of His Father's glory, and the express image of His person. As we watch him, 'intruding into those things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind,' we know not whether he is more wanting in refined taste or in Christian sobriety. He seems not to recognise any limits to curiosity. He has forgotten that 'it is the glory of God to conceal a thing.' If he had six wings, he would grudge using two to cover his face withal. So far as we can see, he has written these three volumes, from beginning to end, without ever bethinking himself that he is on holy ground. As he writes, he never hears a Voice calling unto him out of the midst of the bush, 'Draw not nigh hither; put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground.'

If we strike out from these volumes all glaring repetitions and needless quotations from Scripture, the three volumes would be reduced to two; then let the two be re-written in a clear style, striking out all duplicate words, and the two volumes would condense into one. The book thus gained would be of ordinary quality, on an attractive subject, written upon a wrong principle. Even where the author is sound, his matter is very ordinary. We may read fifty pages, and not meet with a single thought to break the dull monotony of commonplace. He has not the art of making old things seem new, neither does he make amends for saying small things by

putting them skilfully. In the three volumes there is scarcely a sentence that any one would quote for the beauty, force, or compactness of the phraseology.

The author's views of heaven as it is, and of the state of departed human spirits as they now are, do not bear the test of Scripture. In other words, the plot of his drama has no foundation in fact. 'Things are not as they seem.' On leaving the world, saints do *not* at once rise to the highest place. That they do is the doctrine of these volumes, but not of Holy Scripture; and the author only illustrates his own ignorance when he says that we must either accept his views of heaven, or admit that 'the revelations of the Bible on this subject are so many myths.' In affirming that the opinions he has set forth are 'according to our Protestant interpretation' of the word of God, he betrays the narrow limits within which his reading has been confined. The Holy Scriptures, as interpreted by the ablest Protestant writers, do not teach the doctrine of purgatory, neither do they teach the vulgar doctrine which pervades and vitiates these volumes.

ART. IV.—1. *The Works of John Howe, M.A.* In Six Volumes. London: Religious Tract Society. 1862.

2. *The Life and Character of John Howe, M.A.* By HENRY ROGERS. Second Edition. 1863.

WHATEVER opinions may be held as to the character and results of the late Nonconformist commemoration, there can be no doubt that it has done good service by awakening attention to the claims of the great writers of Puritan theology. This will probably be the only legacy of the great Bicentenary. After the lapse of a year, we see no sign that it will give birth to any very remarkable contribution of its own to our literature. No important work on the religious history of the seventeenth century,—that century of confusion,—or on the characters, motives, and deeds of the men who shaped its issues; in short, no such grand apology for Nonconformity as the crisis demanded; seems likely to emerge as a permanent monument of the past year. But, on the other hand, the St. Bartholomew heroes themselves are brought forward to plead their own cause; and their writings are edited and presented to the public in such an attractive form as to produce the effect upon a large class of readers of a complete resuscitation. This is especially true of John Howe, the greatest and best of the

Puritans. His works now lie before us, as they have been edited with much skill and conscientiousness by Professor Rogers, under the auspices of the Religious Tract Society. The editor's well known *Life of Howe*, in a second and improved edition, forms a companion volume. Nothing but a comparison with former editions of *Howe's Works* will give any idea of the wonderful transformation which has been effected by Mr. Rogers' tasteful hand upon the punctuation and other subordinate concomitants of the composition, without the alteration of a single word. In common with many other readers who have been often 'thrown' in the middle of a paragraph, at much expense of patience, we feel laid under great obligation to the loyal devotion of Mr. Rogers. And it is our cordial hope that the popularity of this edition of *Howe's Works* and *Life* will be at least one reward of his pains.

Among all the characters which crowd the latter half of the seventeenth century, there is none which so nearly commands universal homage as that of John Howe. No name conciliates such general respect from all parties, or awakens so much unqualified reverence. Puritanism lost its grim severity in him, and looks amiable to all who have eyes to see the beauty of holiness. Even the High-Churchman can hardly fail to feel some complacency in a man whose learning reflected honour on both the universities, who maintained through life a steady friendship with the best ecclesiastics of the National Church, always showing a readiness to serve their interests when he had the power and they were in need; who, moreover, never lost an opportunity of denouncing the bitterness of mere sectarianism, and both advocated and practised the utmost conformity which was consistent with his principles. Dissenters, of course, of all classes, even those to whom his serene tolerance was not his highest recommendation, unite in honouring his memory as the sublimest and purest representative of their common fundamentals. While to all whose zeal for Christianity is stronger than their party spirit he is venerable as the writer of works which, on the whole, have never been surpassed, in vindication of the Christian faith, in assertion of Christian doctrine, and in the exhibition of the Christian life; who never wrote a sentence that was not faithful to truth and conceived in love; and who, to crown all, maintained in those disordered times a most saintly life,—passing through more than threescore years and ten of most trying probation without leaving a single stain upon his memory.

Something of the tranquil dignity in which *Howe's* name is enshrined to posterity may be due to the fact that we know so

little of the details of his life, and that he is connected with his own generation only by the broad outlines of his history. And this, again, is owing to his own deliberate act on his deathbed. Like the rest of his contemporaries, he had made copious collections of autobiographical notes, and comments upon the events of the times; but these, to the amount of a multitude of small volumes, he commanded his son to burn, without making any use of them. Thus literature was deprived of a work which would have been a worthy companion to those of Clarendon, Burnet, Baxter, and Calamy, as comprehensive and discriminating as the best of them, and more dispassionate than any. It is useless to speculate on what we lost. But if, as we have every reason to infer from the practice of the times, these memoranda stretched over the whole of his life, we can hardly overestimate the blank created by their destruction. We have only to imagine the reminiscences of a year spent with the little band of Cambridge Platonists; the strange disclosures of Cromwell's court, and of the disorderly 'church in his house;' the meditative years spent by Lough Neagh, while the *Living Temple* was being upreared in his thoughts; the active work of his Devonshire pastorate, not surpassed in devotion to duty by Kidderminster itself; the stormy and trying times of the Ejection; the Revolution, and all the internal difficulties among the Nonconformists which followed; in addition to all this, the revelations of the inner life which doubtless made no small part of this daily register;—and we may well share the regret of his obedient son when he executed his father's command. But, on the other hand, there can be no doubt that the portraiture of this great man is all the more harmonious and beautiful in its elements for not being so elaborately painted. The outline is more satisfying probably than the finished picture would have been. His name is connected with few, if any, undignified associations. He is in his age, but not of it; he is not mixed up very largely with its contentions and inconsistencies; but sheds the tranquil and pure light of his life, as reflected from his works, upon his own times and upon ours.

John Howe was born at Loughborough, Leicestershire, in 1630. His father was the parson of the parish; inducted by Laud in the earlier days of his power, and afterwards, like many others, displaced by that prelate for refusing to carry out his ecclesiastic fantasies. He took refuge in Ireland, where he paid the strictest attention to the intellectual and moral training of his son. Nothing is known of the particulars of that training; nor is there any trace of the refugees until the rebel-

lion of 1641 drove them back to England. But there can be no doubt that the youth was educated in the principles which were fast becoming dominant among those who revolted against Laud's semi-Popish restorations. He went to Cambridge at the age of seventeen, as a sizar of Christ College. There he became acquainted with that most interesting little group of Platonists, among whom Cudworth, Henry More, and John Smith were the most shining members, and who at that tragic time were pursuing their philosophical contemplations as in a 'garden enclosed.' He remained at Cambridge only one year; long enough, however, at that impressible time of life, to receive a Platonic tincture from these men, which is traceable throughout his writings. With John Smith, in particular,—the loveliest and, alas! the most shortlived of English theologians,—John Howe had much in common; and it is a curious question to consider what the effect might have been on both had they read together 'the great pagan theologian,' and communed on the great question of the times, a few years more. For some reason or other, not explained, Howe migrated to Oxford, where he took the M.A. degree at the age of twenty-two, and became fellow of Magdalen College. These few years of academical study were years of very severe application. He 'conversed closely with the heathen moralists and philosophers; perused many of the writings of the schoolmen, and several systems and commonplaces of the Reformers.' In fact, he laid the broad and deep foundations of theological learning; like so many others of the great divines of that age, he went into his ministry with more divinity than many in these days acquire through life. But the most remarkable thing mentioned concerning this young leviathan in sacred letters is that, with all his Platonic tendencies, he had compiled for himself a complete system of theology from the Scriptures alone; 'a system which,' as he was afterwards wont to say, 'he had seldom seen occasion to alter.' This illustration of his early maturity—which we are bound to accept literally, as Howe never spoke of himself with unguarded self-complacency—is certainly astonishing. We cannot read the records of the university life of some of our older divines without wondering that fanaticism should ever in England have despised human learning. Howe is but one of many examples to prove that the most elect instruments of the Holy Spirit in the work of the Christian Church have been most thoroughly disciplined in various scholarship at the outset of life.

He left the university with a well-stored and well-disciplined mind; with opinions and principles which for fifty

years remained almost entirely unchanged. He had already established that character of catholic liberality in minor things, combined with scrupulous regard for liberty, which marked him through life. For instance, he declined attendance at certain meetings for Christian fellowship over which Dr. Thomas Goodwin, president of his college, used to preside, and which represented the deepest piety of Oxford. On being remonstrated with by the Doctor, he frankly confessed that the terms of communion were not *catholic* enough, too much stress being laid on peculiarities which he held in slight regard. He stipulated that they should spare him the bondage of their cramped notions, and on these terms he was admitted. This incident expressed a principle of conduct from which he never deviated in after life. A Nonconformist as it respects the Establishment, he was in many things a Nonconformist also as it respects all the multitudinous sects of the day—being, so far as it is possible to be so, a perfect catholic without latitudinarianism.

He was ordained at Winwick, in Lancashire, by Mr. Charles Herle, the second prolocutor of the Westminster Assembly, assisted by several ministers of the neighbouring chapelries. From Howe's remark upon his ordination, 'That there were few men whose ordination had been so truly primitive as his, having been devoted to the sacred office by a primitive bishop and his officiating presbytery,' it might be inferred that he entered the ministry with Presbyterian views. It is probable that some such modification of that system as would have approached the qualified episcopacy proposed by Baxter and Usher, came near his theory; but his practice through life, especially in all that pertained to spiritual discipline, was rather that of a Congregationalist. Certain it is that he entered the ministry with ecclesiastical principles more undefined than the great mass of his brethren.

His first settlement was at Great Torrington, in Devonshire;—a county which was specially favoured by Providence in those times of trial, being blessed with the ministry of such men as Flavel, the Alleines, Hughes, Howe, and many others, the effect of whose labours yet remains in many districts of the west. He entered upon his functions with the ardour of his first pastoral love, and with the resources of a well-stored mind. How fresh and fruitful his preaching must have been in these early years may be gathered from the specimens of it which were afterwards published. How thoroughly in earnest he was, and how entirely his strength was given to the work, may be inferred from his first biographer's account of the

services held on the ordinary fast-days, which were then of common occurrence.

'He told me,' says Calamy, 'it was upon those occasions his common way to begin about nine in the morning with a prayer for about a quarter of an hour, in which he begged a blessing on the work of the day; and afterwards read and expounded a chapter or psalm, in which he spent about three quarters of an hour; then prayed for about an hour, preached for another hour, and prayed for about half an hour. After this, he retired and took some little refreshment for about a quarter of an hour more, (the people singing all the while,) and then came again into the pulpit and prayed for another hour, and gave them another sermon of about an hour's length; and so concluded the service of the day, and about four o'clock in the evening, with about half an hour or more in prayer.'

Such was the Puritan substitute for the festivals which were done away, with all their liturgical glory and grace; or, rather, this was the Puritan recoil from the Laudian superstition which had overlaid that glory and grace with devices borrowed from a ritual which the English mind had come thoroughly to loathe. This picture of a Commonwealth fast cannot be looked at without deep interest. Representing as it does what we know from other sources to have been a very common sanctification of the day throughout the land, it gives us an impressive idea of the desperate earnestness of the religion of that transition time. It shows that, amidst all its political confusion and sectarian conflicts, there was a deep and strong substratum of vital godliness in the people of England; and that, when they threw away the Prayer-Book, stripped the churches, silenced the music, and abolished the feasts of the old worship, they had something instead which was to them a great and precious reality. It shows how 'painful' the pastor was, occupying seven hours of a fasting day, single-handed, or rather single-minded, out of his own resources; and how fully the people gave their time up without weariness to what they regarded as the greatest business of life. But on this subject Professor Rogers, the biographer and, so to speak, spiritual descendant of John Howe, makes the following remarks:—

'Ardent as was the piety of thousands of those times, there can be no doubt that to the severe, uninviting, and exaggerated forms of devotion to which it gave rise, is to be attributed not a little of the licentiousness and irreligion of the succeeding reign. The youth, be it recollected, of the Commonwealth were then in the reign of the second Charles, and were but too likely to take revenge for the constrained austerity in which their childhood was passed, by a

proportionate licence when they became their own masters. We may rest assured that many a little Puritan, who had been tutored into precocious gravity and unnatural decorum under the grim discipline of his austere elders, was loudest in laugh and song, and wildest in folly and dissipation, when the violent constraint under which he had acted was removed. The transformation which passed on his outward man, when the closely-cropped hair expanded into fashionable luxuriance, and the plain, stiff, and closely-filled dress was exchanged for ruffles and embroidery, was not more striking than that transformation of mind, of which indeed it was the expression and the index. Is it at all probable that, except in very rare instances, the ministers (however well disposed the audiences might be) *could* render such services any other than most wearisome? It is just conceivable, indeed, that a man like Howe, distinguished by such exalted piety, by such rare qualifications as a preacher, and by a mind so singularly fertile and original, might sustain the attention of the more intelligent amongst his auditors, making allowance, it may be, for a few oblivious moments; but it is quite appalling to think of the tedium of such a service conducted by men (and there must have been many such) of no more than ordinary piety, and less than ordinary abilities. If, under such circumstances, their congregations *did* maintain their attention, all that can be said is, that there was at least one text of Scripture on which it would have been superfluous for the ministers to expatiate,—“patience” must already have had its “perfect work.”

There is doubtless much truth in these comments. It is impossible to avoid the conclusion that amongst the causes of the Restoration licence recoil from Puritanical rigour was one. But the fast-day has less than justice done it in this passage. It must be remembered that Howe was describing the services of a day honestly given up to God, and set apart for strenuous religious exercises; of a day diligently prepared for both by preacher and people, and spent by both without weariness because both were in earnest. Such days did not come very often in the Puritan calendar; nor were these seven-hour exercises practised on the Sabbath. Moreover, we have no evidence that the children were required to undergo this penance; it is not very probable that the schools and the playgrounds were forsaken on these fast-days, and on the whole we are far from satisfied that such thorough pastoral work as that of Howe and his fellows could ever make religion a bondage to the young. We shall be more likely to form a correct estimate of the effect of the Puritan ministry if we take the wider view of it which the following extracts give. It is Howe who speaks again, but not directly about himself. He is describing a deceased brother, Richard Fairclough, in a

funeral sermon ; but the description perfectly suited his own early ministry.

‘ His labours were almost incredible. Besides his usual exercises on the Lord’s-day, of praying, reading the Scriptures, preaching, catechising, administering the sacraments, (as the occasions or stated seasons occurred,) he usually five times in the week, betimes in the morning, appeared in public, prayed, and preached an expository lecture upon some portion of the holy Scriptures, in course, to such as could then assemble, which so many did, that he always had a considerable congregation ; nor did he ever produce in public anything which did not smell of the lamp. And I know that the most eminent for quality and judgment among his hearers, valued those his morning exercises, for elaborateness, accuracy, instructiveness, equally with his Lord’s-day sermons. Yet also he found time, not only to visit the sick, (which opportunities he caught at with great eagerness,) but also, in a continual course, all the families within his charge ; and personally and severally to converse with every one that was capable, labouring to understand the present state of their souls, and applying himself to them in instructions, reproofs, admonitions, exhortations, and encouragements, suitable thereto : and he went through all with the greatest facility and pleasure imaginable ; his whole heart was in his work.

‘ Every day, for many years together, he used to be up by three in the morning, or sooner, and to be with God (which was his dear delight) when others slept. Few men had ever less hindrance from the body, or more dominion over it ; a better habited mind and body have rarely dwelt together.’

Whatever may be said as to the dry and repulsive preaching of many of his Puritan brethren, certain it is that there was nothing but loveliness and attraction in John Howe’s. We do not mean as to the externals of manner and style. There is not much evidence extant which will allow us to form a judgment as to his popularity in the modern sense ; although we can hardly imagine that the sermons which we study with so much pleasure, but which require such close study, could ever have been very fascinating to an ordinary audience. But the substance and spirit of his teaching was unascetic and full of love. His was a bright theology ; and the face that he turned to his people always beamed, like that of Moses, and for the same reason. The very titles of his successive volumes show how glad was the spirit of his ministry. His first series of sermons were on ‘ Delighting in God ’ and the ‘ Blessedness of the Righteous ; ’ and no one can read them without feeling that the congregations thus fed were not likely to be imbued with gloomy notions of godliness. The following were probably among his fast-day strains :—

'Be confirmed in the apprehension that religion is itself a delightful thing, even *universally* and in the *whole nature of it*; whereby a double practical mistake and error will be avoided, that greatly obstructs and hinders the actual relish and sensation of that delight: 1. That either religion is, in the whole nature of it, such a thing to which delight must be alien, and banished from it, as if nothing did belong to or would consist with it, but our severities, pensiveness, and sad thoughts. Or else, 2. That if any delight did belong to it at all, it must be found only in peculiar, extraordinary assurances and persuasions of God's love; and be the attainment, consequently, of none but more eminent Christians. If therefore you will have a religion, and you have *any reason* for that resolution, by the *same reason* you would have any, you must have the pleasant, delightful religion we speak of,—and that it is itself so delightful, if you had nothing to inform you but the report of such as profess to have tried and found it so, methinks that at least should provoke you to try also. How sluggish a temper doth it argue, not to be desirous to know the utmost that is in it! It were even a laudable curiosity to resolve upon making trial; to get into the inmost centre of it; to pierce and press onward till you reach the seat of life,—till you have got the secret, and the very heart of religion, and your heart do meet and join in one. Did you never try experiments for your pleasure? Try this one. See what you will find in withdrawing yourself from all things else, and becoming entirely devoted to God through the Redeemer;—to live *after His will* and in *His presence*. Try the difference between viewing truths to please your genius, or using Divine ordinances to keep up the custom, to conform yourself to those you live among, and help to make a solemn show; and doing these things with a serious design to get into an acquaintance with God, to have your soul transformed into His image, that you may have present and eternal fellowship with Him. Try how much better it is to have your lives governed by an awful and dutiful respect to God, than to follow your own wild and enormous inclinations; and whether it be not better, what good thing soever you do, to do it for the Lord's sake, than from base and sordid motives. And why should you be of so mean and abject a spirit, as to content yourself to be held at the door and in the outer courts of religion, when others enter in and taste the rich provisions of God's house?—And will you dream and slumber all your days? How much time have you lost that might have been pleasantly spent in a course of godliness! Do you not aim at a life of eternal delights with God? If you now begin not to live to God, when will you? That life which you reckon shall never end with you, must yet have a beginning. Will you defer till you die your beginning to live? Have you any hope God will deal in a peculiar way with you from all men, and make the other world the place of your first heart change? How dismal should it be to you to look in, and still find your heart dead towards God and the things of God, so that you have no delight in them! Think what the beginnings of the Divine life, and the

present delights of it, must be the earnest of to you, and make sure the ground betime of so great a hope.'

Howe had not long been settled in Great Torrington before he made an endeavour to satisfy the catholic instincts of his heart by establishing 'a settled meeting of the neighbouring ministers of *different persuasions*' for mutual edification. This was an imitation of Baxter's now celebrated 'Association,' the fame of which had spread from Worcestershire far and wide. These efforts at an Evangelical Alliance, combining Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Episcopalians, had become by this time very common in the southern counties of England; and, although the sublime project which fascinated Baxter through life, and in which Howe, though with less enthusiasm, joined him,—viz., that of framing a comprehension which should heal all the dissensions of religion,—was never anything more than a golden dream, nevertheless these Associations were fruitful of much incidental and subordinate good. Mr. George Hughes, of Plymouth, was one of the brethren of this confraternity. Soon after Howe's settlement in Devonshire, a close intimacy sprang up between the two men; Howe having married Mr. Hughes' daughter. They kept up for a long time a weekly correspondence in Latin, of which, however, singular enough, only one passage now remains. It was the closing sentence of a letter from Mr. Hughes,—'*Sit ros cæli super habitaculum vestrum*,' 'May the dew of heaven be upon your dwelling,'—which came to hand on the very same day that a fire in Howe's house had been providentially extinguished by a shower of rain. The friendship of these relatives was continued through good and through evil report for many long years. They rejoiced together during these few untroubled months; they went out together in the great Ejection; they endured privation, persecution, and probably imprisonment, together; and when in 1667 the elder Hughes died at Kingsbridge, leaving behind him a fragrant memory that continued far into the next century as a gracious tradition,—he was generally termed the 'Apostle of the West,'—his son Mr. Obadiah Hughes continued the friendship.

When Howe had been three years in Great Torrington, and had begun to exert a salutary influence on the whole district, a circumstance that might have seemed accidental, changed for a season the current of his life. Certain business took him to London, accident detained him there an extra Sunday, and curiosity led him to Whitehall to hear one of the Protector's

preachers. Cromwell, 'who generally had his eyes everywhere,' as Calamy says, observed the stately form and expressive countenance of the young man. He requested Howe to 'preach at Whitehall on the next Lord's day;' and would take no denial, promising to provide for the Torrington flock, whose lack of his own service Howe vainly pleaded. A second and third sermon Cromwell required; and then, in terms which allowed no contradiction, insisted on his coming to London to be his domestic chaplain. With great reluctance Howe transferred his little family to London; comforting himself with the assurance that a good substitute would be sent to Devonshire, and with the hope of being made an instrument of good in his new and untried sphere.

We cannot help thinking that this was not altogether so fortuitous a matter on Cromwell's part as it might seem. Those eyes that were rolling about under the sermon at Whitehall were in the habit of scrutinizing every corner of the land. There was much in John Howe's reported character for uprightness and moderation that would recommend him to the Protector, the greatest of whose many great difficulties sprang from the disorderly rabble of sects which religious liberty, debased into licence, had spawned in the land. Howe's learning and ecclesiastical sobriety would make him a fit mediator between the government and the disaffected clergy; his prudence and tolerant firmness would make him a valuable adviser to Cromwell, in his conduct towards the whole mob of sectaries—Papists, Vanists, Seekers, Shakers, Ranters, Quakers, Behmenists, and fanatics of other nameless forms—who gave the Protector no rest night or day; while his piety and devotion would recommend him to whatever Christian principle still remained in the depths of the Protector's unfathomed heart. The sagacity which made Milton one of his secretaries, and Hale one of his judges, and which contrived to maintain his supremacy in the midst of and above all those refractory elements until death saved him from defeat, was not disappointed in the choice of Howe as one of his chaplains.

John Howe's residence at Whitehall did not extend to two years; but it was a time of great trial and embarrassment. His cares were diversified and pressing: in addition to the religious duties of his chaplaincy, he was Cromwell's secretary for religious affairs, both home and foreign, the almoner of his large bounties, and the mediator between him and a multitude of applicants for favour. It was this last department of his functions which, perhaps, gave the chaplain most satisfaction, or rather least dissatisfaction, during his service at Whitehall. His disinterestedness and integrity in the employ-

ment of his great influence won him universal praise. He served all parties, did his best for every suitor, and befriended every worthy object. Several striking instances are on record. Seth Ward, afterwards bishop of Exeter, requested his good offices with the Protector to give him the vacant principalship of Jesus College, Oxford. That post had just been filled up; but Howe's recommendation obtained for Ward from Cromwell the promise of an income equal to that of the principalship. Many an Episcopalian came to Howe for advice how to get through the stiff ordeal of the 'Triers.' Thomas Fuller was one of them. 'You may observe, Sir,' said the humourist, 'that I am a somewhat corpulent man, and I am to go through a very strait passage: I beg you would be so good as to give me a shove, and help me through.' The advice was given, and Fuller went before the grim tribunal. They proposed the usual question, 'Whether he had ever had any experience of a work of grace on his heart?' and he answered, 'that he could appeal to the Searcher of hearts, that he made a conscience of his very thoughts,'—an answer with which they could not well be otherwise than satisfied. Protestant grievances were constantly pouring in from all parts of the Continent; and Howe's prudence was always in demand and never at fault. In short, he was the ready patron of all interests but his own. 'You have obtained,' Cromwell once said to him, 'many favours for others; I wonder when the time is to come that you will solicit anything for yourself or your family.'

The only favour which Howe could have longed for, was his own dismissal to the more congenial duties and cares of his Devonshire charge. He never felt at ease in the Protector's establishment. For this there were many reasons. However diligently and dexterously he might discharge the secret duties of state in which his master employed him, these duties could not but be irksome to a mind intent on far different things. Then the restless turmoils and intrigues from which the seat of no government was ever free, must have kept him in constant disquiet. But, worst of all, the disorder, fanaticism, and practical antinomianism of his pastoral charge fairly vanquished his faith and his hope. He wrote to Baxter for advice as to his own conduct; and a few extracts from his letters will serve to show, and in the most authentic way, why Howe was so anxious to leave. They will also contribute to our general design, by exhibiting the character of the writer, and throwing light on the times:—

'Sir, I presume upon your pardon for this trouble. I shall only add to it thus much. I perceive you have understood, by my uncle,

where my present station is. If you can think it worth your while, I should be exceeding desirous to hear from you, what you apprehend to be the main evils of the nation, that you judge capable of redress by the present government?—what you conceive one in my station obliged to urge upon them as matter of duty in reference to the present state of the nation?—and how far you conceive such a one obliged to bear a public testimony against their neglects in preaching, after use of private endeavours; supposing that either they be not convinced that the things persuaded to are duties to them, or else, if they be, that it be from time to time pretended that other affairs of greater moment are before them for the present; which being secret to themselves, as I cannot certainly know that they are so, so nor can I deny that they may be. Sir, the Lord knows I desire to understand my duty in matters of this nature; I hope He will then give me a heart not to decline it.'

Oliver had evidently been baffling his conscientious chaplain and pastor. Passing over Baxter's reply, and those parts of the correspondence which related to the visionary scheme of comprehension, we make another extract from a letter written when affairs had grown worse. It begins with Howe's hopelessness as to the comprehension.

'Nor do I hope for much success on any further treaty with him [Mr. Nye]. I perceive so steady a resolution to measure all endeavours of this kind by their subservience to the advantage of one party. I resolve, therefore, to make trial what his highness will do, as speedily as I can. My time will not serve me long; for I think I shall be constrained in conscience (all things considered) to return, ere long, to my former station. I left it, I think, upon very fair terms. For, first, when I settled there, I expressly reserved to myself a liberty of removing, if the providence of God should invite me to a condition of more serviceableness anywhere else,—which liberty I reckon I could not have parted with if I would, unless I could have exempted myself from God's dominion. My call hither was a work I thought very considerable;—the setting up of the worship and discipline of Christ in this family, wherein I was to have joined with another, called upon the same account;—I had made, as I supposed, a competent provision for the place I left. But now at once I see the designed work here hopelessly laid aside. We affect here to live in so loose a way, that a man cannot fix upon any certain charge to carry towards them as a minister of Christ should: so that it were as hopeful a course to preach in a market, or in any assembly met by chance, as here..... [Postscript.] Sir, the affected disorderliness of this family as to the matters of God's worship, (whence arises my despair of doing good here,) I desire as much as is possible to conceal, and therefore resolve, to others, to insist upon the necessitous condition of the place I left as the reason of my removal, (if I do remove); to your-

self I state my case more fully, as expecting some direction and help from you about it; but I desire you to be very sparing in making it known as 'tis here represented.'

Evidently Howe had a severe struggle with himself. Baxter seems to have thrown obstacles in the way of his leaving the palace. The next letter ends with a touch of most exquisite pathos:—

'Here my influence is not like to be much (as it is not to be expected that a raw young man should be very considerable among *grandees*); my work little; my success hitherto little; my hopes, considering the temper of this place, very small; especially coupling it with the temper of my spirit, which, did you know it, alone would, I think, greatly alter your judgment of this case. I am naturally bashful, pusillanimous, easily browbeaten, solicitous about the fitness or unfitness of speech or silence, afraid (especially having to do with those who are constant in *arcana imperii*) of being accounted uncivil or busy, &c.; and the distemper being natural (most intrinsically) is less curable. I have devoted myself to serve God in the work of the ministry, and how can I want the pleasure of hearing their cryings and complaints, who have come to me under convictions, &c. ? I shall beseech you to weigh my case again.'

It was not only, however, in letters to Baxter that Howe expressed his resentment of the practices of Oliver's 'court.' He was not either 'pusillanimous' or 'easily browbeaten' in the discharge of his duty as a minister of God. And, when occasion demanded, he was ready with his protest. For instance, an opinion prevailed in the Protector's household, that the particular thing asked in prayer by the people of God would be granted, whatever it might be: an opinion which rested on a fanatical perversion of Scripture, and led to all manner of extravagance. The chaplain felt it his duty to preach against the doctrine a discourse on 'A particular Faith in Prayer.' The Protector was observed ominously to knit his brows; and, after the service, a 'person of distinction' intimated to the preacher that he had irrecoverably lost his highness's favour. Howe afterwards said that Cromwell felt the sermon, 'was cooler to him in his carriage than before, and sometimes seemed as though he would have spoken to him on the subject; but never did.' This authentic anecdote speaks well both for the preacher and the hearer. And it further seems to vindicate the 'court' from the imputation of reckless profligacy. Such a censor as John Howe would not have spared the vices of a profligate court: indeed, such a censor would not have remained a month in such a charge.

Baxter's influence induced him to remain at his post. Howe

accordingly suggested to the Protector a kind of compromise, by which he retained his ministerial relation to Torrington. He stipulated for permission to pass three months in the year with his old flock, another minister being constantly resident, and receiving the temporalities. Thus Howe became a pluralist of a very innocent type; but the death of the Protector, and the deposition of his feeble son, enabled him to return with a glad heart to Devonshire. He took his leave of politics in a very striking letter to Baxter, which, after a sad picture of the men who now made themselves 'keepers of the liberty of England,' ends with the following words:—

'Sir, such persons as are now at the head of affairs will blast religion, if God prevent not. The design you writ me of, some time since, to introduce infidelity or Popery, they have opportunity enough to effect. I know some leading men are not Christians. *Religion is lost out of England, farther than as it can creep into corners.* Those in power, who are friends to it, will no more suspect those persons than these ourselves. I am returning to my old station, being now at liberty beyond dispute.'

During the mad excitement of the Restoration, Howe kept himself quiet in Torrington. He strove to forget in pastoral labours the bewildering dream of the past two years. But the petty persecution which preceded the Act of Uniformity soon marked out the late spiritual director of the usurper as a victim. Information was laid against him by two of those miscreants who haunted the congregations as spies in the service of bigotry; and he appeared at the sessions to answer a charge of having preached sedition and treason. His vindication was triumphant, and the following year he spent in comparative peace. Then came Bartholomew-day, August 24th, 1662, when two thousand honest men bade farewell to their flocks. John Howe was one of these. Amongst all the congregations that spent that day in tears none was more deeply affected than that of Great Torrington. Nor was there one that sustained a severer loss.

The sermons in which he gave his principal reasons for refusing to subscribe have not been preserved. But there is no lack of explicit evidence as to the character of his scruples. The first of the requirements of the Act was quite sufficient to justify the course he took, and rendered it needless even to consider the remaining four. Hence, we find that he made this the leading point of his scruple, when pressed by Bishop Ward for his *reasons*. This was the bishop who had been indebted to Howe in other days, as we have seen; and he would have been very glad if he had been allowed to repay the benefit. 'Pray, sir,' said Dr. Ward, after Howe had specified

reordination as his point of scruple, 'what *hurt* is there in being twice ordained?' '*Hurt*, my lord!' rejoined Howe, 'it hurts my understanding; the thought is shocking; it is an absurdity; since nothing can have two beginnings. I am sure I am a minister of Christ, and am ready to debate that matter with your lordship, if your lordship pleases; but I cannot begin again to be a minister.' The bishop, who afterwards distinguished himself by his intolerance, dismissed Howe with every token of regard, promised him preferment if he should conform, and suppressed a process which had been too harshly issued against Howe from his own court.

That Howe was by no means a factious or bigoted Nonconformist was proved by the whole tenor of his life; and in particular, by the fact, that he was one of the very few who took the oath of the Oxford Act in 1665. This Act, passed by a Parliament held at Oxford, called upon all Nonconformist ministers to swear 'that it was not lawful, on any pretence whatever, to take arms against the king; that they abhorred the traitorous position of taking arms by his authority against his person, or against those commissioned by him, in pursuance of such commission; and that they would not at any time endeavour any alteration of the government, either in Church or State.' The penalty attached to refusal was 'not being allowed, except on the high road, to come within five miles of any city, or corporation, or any place that sent burgesses to Parliament, or any place where they had been ministers, or had preached, since the Act of Oblivion.' But, although this subscription might in some respects temper the severity of his lot, these were years of great hardship to Howe. He was a wanderer, procuring a precarious subsistence. The record of those sad years of poverty, the only alleviations of which were the 'stolen waters' of an occasional furtive service and sermon in a secret haunt, is lost. Perhaps some of those little volumes which he would not suffer to go down to posterity contained the chronicle of these years of entire dependence on Divine Providence. It may easily be supposed that many a passage would be narrated there which Howe's characteristic dignity recoiled from throwing open to the public eye. 'Many of them,' he said, in a document published long afterwards, which doubtless stated his own case, 'live upon charity; some of them with difficulty getting, and others (educated to modesty) *with greater difficulty* begging, their bread.' In the year 1668, probably under the impulse of need, he prepared for the press his sermons on *The Blessedness of the Righteous*, a volume which was very favourably received by the public. Thus

commenced a career of authorship, which continued in an unbroken series of efforts, for more than thirty years. Probably, the success of this first volume had something to do with the next change in his fortunes.

In 1671 Howe removed to Ireland as domestic chaplain to Lord Massarene, of Antrim Castle. In this godly establishment he had perfect repose for five years. He not only rested from persecution, and from all the embarrassments of a precarious ministry, but was treated with great deference by the bishop and clergy of the diocese. He had authority to preach, without any condition of conformity or compromise, in the parish church every Sunday afternoon. Such was the respect paid to his character as a minister that the archbishop signified his wish that every pulpit should be open to him whenever he was free to preach. He also kept up his old habits of intercourse with the presbyterian ministers of the neighbourhood; in conjunction with one of whom he presided over a seminary for theological students. But the most interesting circumstance connected with this period is the fact that amidst the solitudes of Lough Neagh his mature mind conceived the plan and proportions of his *Living Temple*, the first part of which he finished before leaving Ireland. The subtlety of reasoning and sublimity of sentiment which characterise this grand treatise demanded for their perfect expression such a scene of perfect sequestration as this. Howe's self-centred genius could doubtless always and everywhere make its own solitude for its creative processes; but it is remarkable that the only season of deep repose that he ever enjoyed gave birth to his most sustained works. Professor Rogers draws attention to the remarkable coincidence that Jeremy Taylor, when he was a short time before under the cloud which shadowed episcopacy, produced amidst similar scenes of romantic beauty, and not far from the same neighbourhood, his great and comprehensive work on casuistry, the *Ductor Dubitantium*.

From this serene elevation Howe looked down upon the religious strife from which he was shut in, but into which he was soon to enter again, with a wise and tolerant charity that grandly contrasted with the prevalent spirit of his own times and of ours. Dedicating his volume of discourses on *Delighting in God* to his Torrington flock, who had heard the substance of them not long before, he uses such words as these, which give us an interesting insight into one Nonconformist's heart, the type, we believe, of many others:—

'Great reason have I to repent that I have not with greater earnestness pressed upon you the known and important things

wherein serious Christians do generally agree. But I repent not I have been so little engaged in the hot contests of our age, about the things wherein they differ. For, as I pretend to little light in these things, (whence I could not have much confidence to fortify me unto such an undertaking,) so I must profess to have little inclination to contend about matters of that kind. Nor yet am I indifferent as to those smaller things, that I cannot discern to be in their nature so. But though I cannot avoid to think that course right which I have deliberately chosen therein, I do yet esteem that but a small thing on which to ground an opinion of my excelling them that think otherwise, as if I knew more than they. For I have often recounted thus seriously with myself: that of every differing party in those circumstantial matters, I do particularly know some persons by whom I find myself much excelled in far greater things than is the matter of that difference. I cannot, it is true, thereupon say and think everything that they do; which is impossible, since they differ from one another as well as me. And I understand well, there are other measures of truth than this or that excellent person's opinion. But I thereupon reckon I have little reason to be conceited of any advantage I have of such in point of knowledge, (even as little as he should have, that can sing and play well on a lute, of him that knows how to command armies or govern a kingdom,) and can with less confidence differ from them, or contend with them; being thereby, though I cannot find I err in these matters, constrained to have some suspicion lest I do; and to admit it possible enough that some of them who differ from me, having much more light in greater matters, may have so in these also. Besides, that I most seriously think humility, charity, and patience would more contribute to the composing of these lesser differences, or to the good estate of the Christian interest under them, than the most fervent disputes and contestations.'

After five years of release, during which he had been hidden as in a pavilion from the strife of tongues,—passing literally the *mezzo cammino* of life amidst all that was pleasant and propitious,—Providence called him back to the arena. He was invited to succeed Dr. Seaman, one of the ablest Presbyterians in London, lately deceased. Hearing that Stephen Charnock was his rival in the suffrages of part of the congregation, Howe resolved to visit London. A document has been found in which he had noted down the colloquies which he held with himself on this grave occasion. Nothing can be more affecting than the revelation which these notes give us of his supreme devotion to God and reverence for his own conscience. They carry self-scrutiny to the very utmost point, almost to the verge of morbid excess. The result of his visit was, that John Howe became a Nonconformist minister in London—a position which he held, although with several

interruptions, until his death. On his arrival in the metropolis he found the Dissenters enjoying a measure of comparative relief. Charles had issued an Indulgence which, although soon withdrawn in deference to his partisan Parliament, somewhat ameliorated for some years the condition of the Nonconformists. Howe was wise enough at once to avail himself of every opportunity of peacefully doing the work of his life. His learning, gentleness, and worth soon won him the reverence of all his own party, and the intimate friendship of the most distinguished men in the Establishment,—such as Tillotson, Stillingfleet, Sharp, Fowler, and Lucas.

Almost immediately on his return to England, he raised his reputation to the highest point by the publication of the first part of the *Living Temple*. This work, as its grand proportions were sketched in the author's mind, was no less than a complete system of theology. The first part against atheism, and atheism disguised as pantheism and deism, aimed at a full demonstration of the being of God, the great object of worship, and of His 'conversableness with man.' This argumentative vindication of the great truth on which all other truth rests was undertaken by Howe as a stern duty. The English mind had become familiar with infidel and atheistic speculations through the works of Lord Herbert of Cherbury, of Hobbes, and Spinoza, leaders of an attack on Christianity which, after being committed to the feebler hands of Blount, Toland, Collins, Woolston, and Tindal, spent itself in Bolingbroke—to be renewed by other persons in our own days. And Howe met this advancing host of enemies by an exhibition of the principles of natural and revealed religion, which takes rank in English apologetics among the very first in order both of time and of merit. The argument for the being of God derived from universal consent is put in full strength, and without being weakened, as it has been elsewhere, by an improper alliance with the doctrine of 'innate ideas.' The *à priori* demonstration is used with peculiar discrimination; and without any of the fallacy which runs through Clarke's subsequent use of it. And Howe's contribution to that cumulative *à posteriori* argument which has commanded conviction from the days of Plato downwards strikingly anticipated a series of works which have honestly borrowed from it and rendered it, so far as popular service goes, obsolete. Taken as a whole, the first part of the *Living Temple* was the ablest controversial work on the being of God that Christendom had seen. And it will never cease, by its strength of argument, its exquisite subtilty, its sublime superiority to every species of argumentation unworthy

of the dignity of the theme, and its occasional transcendent eloquence, to occupy a place amongst the noblest specimens of English controversial theology. The second part, which treats of the great provision for man's worship of God in the temple, ruined but restored, was not published until thirty years afterwards.

Soon after the appearance of this great work, Robert Boyle, doubtless impressed by it with the conviction that Howe's qualities of mind were eminently fitted for the task, prompted him to publish a treatise on the eternally vexed question of the reconciliation of God's prescience of man's sin with the wisdom and sincerity of His counsels and exhortations. His admirable treatise on that subject is a model for all polemics on a theme which will never cease, until the Final Arbiter shall come, to distract the faith of the Church. His treatment of the difficulty is marked by the same negative and defensive moderation with which he afterwards approached the doctrine of the Trinity. He leaves the main difficulties of Calvinism and Arminianism untouched. Two propositions only he denies: first, that there is no such attribute of the Divine nature as foreknowledge; and, secondly, that God irresistibly determines the will to that which He punishes. He abstains from any investigation of the mode of the Divine foreknowledge, and from any hypothesis as to the deepest grounds of human responsibility; and is content with taking the one and the other for granted. His object is simply to reconcile the Divine character *with itself*; and in exhibiting the wisdom of the Governor of the universe, and the sincerity of the God of holiness, he meets all the difficulties of the case by such a series of *analogical* arguments as cannot be resisted. It is true that this treatise, which involved Howe in controversy with the intemperate on both sides, does not relieve this awful controversy of the darkness which besets it. Its final mystery it reverently abstains from even the thought of solving. But it does effectually silence those who go to the two fearful extremes,—that of robbing God of His essential perfection on the one hand, and that of taking away man's accountability on the other. It establishes a foundation on which, sooner or later, we think all Christian minds will come to repose. After pondering it carefully, we feel that it is well for our weary speculation to cease, and to *rest in hope*.

Down to the year 1681, which introduced the darkest hour, the very midnight, of the Nonconformist cause, Howe's dignity of character and consummate prudence secured him from the worst effects of persecution. But many of the best men that ever lived felt it in all its virulence. The notorious 'Indul-

gence' having been withdrawn, the Nonconformists were pestered with the persecutions of innumerable previous enactments, which were enforced with more or less rigour, according to the unpopularity of the victim, or the caprice of the persons invested with brief authority to administer these disgraceful laws. Howe laboured hard to soften the asperity of one party, and to exhort the other to patience. Especially at that crisis when the nation was convulsed with dread of the Popish plot, he used the influence which beyond any other living Nonconformist he enjoyed, with the great, whether in Church or State, to promote his favourite scheme of 'comprehension.' But Howe's anxiety to promote an accommodation between the Church and the Nonconformists did not spring from any abandonment or even modification of his principles. This was strikingly illustrated when in 1680 Stillingfleet, an old friend of his, preached and published an intolerant sermon on 'The Mischief of Separation.' One of the positions of this bitter sermon is this, 'that though the *really conscientious* Nonconformist is justified in not worshipping after the prescribed forms of the Church of England, or rather would be *criminal* if he did so; yet he is not less criminal in setting up a *separate* assembly.' The quaint dilemma to which the sensitive Dissenter was thus reduced, tempted Howe to enter the lists. He defended the Nonconformists vigorously; but at the same time with such urbanity of style, that his opponent heartily thanked him for his kindness and his prayers. About the same time Tillotson, another friend of Howe's, committed himself in an equally paradoxical manner. From the text, 'And the people answered and said, God forbid that we should forsake the Lord to serve other gods,' he contrived to deduce the argument, 'that no man is obliged to preach against the religion of his country, though a false one, unless he has the power of working miracles.' But we must give Mr. Rogers' account of what followed, for the sake of the light it throws on the times and the men that moulded them.

'The irreligious monarch, as was often the case, slept during the greater part of the sermon. As soon as the service was over, a nobleman stepped up and said, "It is a pity your majesty slept, for we have had the rarest piece of *Hobbism* that ever you heard in your life." "Odsfish!" exclaimed the king, "he shall print it then." When printed, the dean, as was usual with him, sent a copy to Howe, who, on perusing it, was filled with alarm. He instantly sent the dean a long letter of expostulation, which, unhappily, has not been preserved.—This letter Howe carried himself, and delivered into Tillotson's own hands. After hastily glancing at its contents,

the dean told Howe that he was willing freely to discuss the matter with him; and proposed that, to insure uninterrupted privacy, they should ride together a little way into the country. Howe accepted the invitation, and they agreed to dine that day at the Lady Falconbridge's at Sutton Court. As they rode together in the dean's chariot, Howe read his letter aloud, more fully explaining and enforcing it as he went on. Tillotson, at length convinced that the doctrine he had advocated was utterly untenable, even wept over his error, and declared that "this was the unhappiest thing which had for a long time happened to him." In mitigation of his fault, however, he pleaded "that he had been unexpectedly summoned by the lord chamberlain to preach on that day,—the individual whose turn it was having been suddenly taken ill; that, having little time for preparation, he had fastened on the topic which was at that period uppermost in the public mind—the fear of Popery; and lastly, that suddenly after he had delivered the sermon, he received the king's command to print it, which rendered all revision impossible."

Schemes of comprehension were about this time much talked about; and Howe was on more than one occasion consulted as to the terms of compromise which would be accepted by the Nonconformists. But when, at the close of 1680, the Bill of Exclusion was thrown out of the House of Lords, these proposals seem to have ceased.

The persecutions which confined Howe to his own dwelling, and which so much restricted his usefulness as a preacher, afforded him both opportunity and incentive to make the most diligent use of the press. During these years he published a considerable portion of his miscellaneous works; and was doubtless deeply engaged upon the second part of his *Living Temple*. He issued from this retirement several very pathetic appeals, touching the maladies of the times, both to the public and to individuals. On the execution of Lord William Russell, he sent an anonymous letter of condolence to his widow, which is a perfect specimen both of epistolary art and religious pathos. In another style, he addressed Bishop Barlow a letter of expostulation on occasion of his intemperate address to his clergy. About this time also he published his treatise on *The Redeemer's Tears wept over lost Souls*, one of the most forcible and affecting pieces of practical divinity our language possesses, one that has always been highly prized and proportionately useful. The reader of this intense exhibition of a sinner's responsibility may set out with something like a recoil from the application of Jerusalem's reprobate state to the condition of an individual sinner; and may feel to the end that the passage has been somewhat forced in that application. But he will be constrained to admit that the sternest points of

its doctrine are in harmony with Scripture, and with the analogy of God's dealings. And whatever of repulsive and harsh he may meet with, is all charmed from his thoughts by the mercy and hope that pervade the treatise. The magnificent conclusion redeems the whole strain, and saves this most pathetic work from being an exception to the general tenderness of Howe's writings.

In the last year of the wretched reign of Charles II., the woes of the Puritan clergy reached their climax. Howe with many others retired to the Continent; preferring active service and employment, even in banishment, to an inglorious, irritating, and useless struggle with the laws at home. Had he remained in England, he might indeed have comforted his flock by private ministrations; but the Conventicle Act and other stray persecuting statutes, which were not allowed to sleep, would have made almost every such act an offence, liable to severe punishment. All that such men as Howe could do was to use their influence for changing the law, or wait quietly, 'having fled to another city,' until Providence should change it for them. The following keen sentences from the 'Case of the Dissenters,' presented to Parliament after the Revolution, will show what the feelings even of the most moderate Nonconformists were at this time. In this document of Howe we have the truth simply and forcibly stated; authenticating, while abstaining from dwelling on, the details of violence done to life, liberty, and property, which might seem to be extravagant as we read them in the histories of the times.

'And let the tenor be considered, by which our Magna Charta was torn in pieces; the worst and most infamous of mankind, at our own expense, hired to accuse us; multitudes of perjuries committed, convictions made without a jury, and without any hearing of the persons accused; penalties inflicted, goods rifled, estates seized and embezzled, houses broken up, families disturbed, often at unreasonable hours of the night, without any cause, or shadow of a cause, if only a malicious villain would pretend to suspect a meeting there! No law in any other case like this! As if to worship God without these additions, which were confessed unnecessary, were a greater crime than theft, felony, murder, or treason! Is it for our reputation to posterity that the memory of such a law should be continued?'

Howe did not, strictly speaking, fly from the persecution. He received an invitation to accompany Lord Wharton 'in his travels on the Continent;' an invitation which he regarded as a 'providence which gave him a present quiet abode and some prospect of usefulness.' From the Continent he sent his flock

a pastoral address, in which he assured them of his purpose to return whenever he should hear of 'any door open of service;' gave them the most pathetic counsels as to their deportment; and commended to them that spirit of tranquil meekness which was the law of his own life. We must quote one sentence.

'And how easy and pleasant is it to one's own self to be void of all wrathfulness, and vindictive designs or inclinations towards any other man! For my own part, I should not have that peace and consolation in a suffering condition (as my being so many years under restraint from that pleasant work of pleading with sinners that they might be saved, is the greatest suffering I was liable to in this world) as through the goodness of God I have found, and do find, were I not conscious to myself of no other than kind or benign thoughts towards them I have suffered by, and that my heart tells me I desire not the least hurt to them that would do me the greatest; and that I feel within myself an unfeigned love and high estimation of divers, accounting them pious and worthy persons, and hoping to meet them in the all-reconciling world.'

After a year's travel, no 'door' having opened at home, he settled in Utrecht, opened a home for English lodgers, and soon found himself the pastor of a very distinguished and devout church in his own house. Another year was thus spent in active service of various kinds. Burnet visited him at Utrecht; and we have a curious relic of their conversation. The future bishop expressed his conviction that 'Nonconformity would not last long; that, after Baxter, Bates, and he (Howe) were once laid in their graves, it would die of itself.' We need hardly give Howe's luminous reply to this shallow and characteristic remark. William of Orange also honoured him with several interviews, conversing with great freedom about 'his old master, Oliver,' and many other things that were then revolving in his own still mind. When intelligence came of James' desperate 'declaration for liberty of conscience,' which, whatever else it signified, opened the way for the Nonconformists' return, the sagacious prince warned Howe and his brethren against being profuse in their 'congratulatory addresses,' and begged them to deal very circumspectly with so suspicious a revolution in the king's policy.

The event, as is well known, justified William's sagacity. No sooner had Howe returned than he found his own party under the strong solicitation of the court to sanction the king's 'dispensing power' as applied to the Papists and themselves. A meeting was held in Howe's house, as to the result of which the king himself was very anxious. He sent messenger after messenger to express his anxiety. These returned to the king

with a noble answer, which the meeting adopted mainly through Howe's influence, that 'if the king expected that they should join in approving such a conduct as would give liberty to the Papists, they would rather that his majesty should resume their own.' Although some few of the ministers 'closeted with the king were drawn too far into the snare,' the far greater number held out. Howe himself more than once had to resist this private fascination. No page in our history is brighter or better known than that which records the almost unanimous and unexampled combination of clergy and Nonconformists to resist the king's attempt to restore Popery.

While the 'seven bishops' were in the tower, Howe was invited to dine with Dr. Sherlock, Master of the Temple. The short-sighted Doctor suggested that the places of so many dignitaries and clergy must be filled up, and asked Howe to inform him what the Nonconformists would do if they were offered the places, and what he himself would do if offered the Mastership of the Temple. Howe's reply was one that we find it hard to understand. He replied, that 'the issue of the present perplexed state of affairs was altogether uncertain; that it was improbable that Dr. Sherlock's fears should ever be realised; that if they should, he could not venture to answer for the conduct of the Nonconformists as a body, as they were split into different parties, and as those parties were actuated by different principles; that he could answer only for *himself*; that, so far as he was concerned, he did not hesitate to say that, should such an improbable case occur as that which the Doctor had supposed, he should not feel himself warranted in declining altogether an opportunity of more public usefulness, should it be offered on such terms as he could conscientiously accept; *but that as for* any emolument accruing from such a situation, he should have nothing to do with it, except as the channel to convey it to the legal proprietor.' This reply is said to have thrown the Doctor into ecstasies. It throws us into some doubt whether Calamy has given us here the whole truth.

After the Revolution the Nonconformists, who had been graciously received by William, were delivered from all their external troubles, although not without some threatening of parliamentary restrictions, which gave occasion to Howe's manly and thorough statement of the 'Case of the Dissenters.' The Act of Toleration, passed May 24th, 1689, however imperfect as a piece of legislation, gave them their final release; and diffused gladness throughout the nation. Once more Howe's wisdom was displayed in his earnest exhortations to a moderate, chastened, and devout enjoyment of victory.

He published his *Humble Requests both to Conformists and Dissenters*, which breathes a spirit of sublime composure, strangely at variance with the unchastened tumult of the public feeling. A few scattered sentences would not fairly represent the spirit of this production, which deserves to be read by all as if written for the present time. But there is something so supremely elevated above the prevalent strain alike of Episcopalian and of Dissenting opinion, whether in Howe's time or since, in his remarks upon prayer and preaching, that we must find room for them. Such paragraphs—and this may be said of great numbers scattered up and down his controversial or pastoral writings—deserve to be collected into a volume for the benefit of the modern representatives of Howe's nonconformity.

‘Moreover, there is, besides understanding and judgment, and diverse from that heavenly gift which in the Scriptures is called grace, such a thing as gust and relish belonging to the mind of man, and, I doubt not, to all men, if they observe themselves; and this is as unaccountable and as various as the relishes and disgusts of sense. As to those parts of worship which are of most frequent use in our assemblies, (whether conforming or nonconformist,) prayer, and preaching, and hearing God's word, our differences about them cannot but in part arise from the diversity of this principle, both on the one hand and on the other. One sort do more savour prayer by a foreknown form; another, that which hath more of surprise, by a grateful variety of unexpected expressions. And it can neither be universally said, it is a better judgment or more grace that determines men the one way or the other; but somewhat in the temper of their minds, distinct from both, which I know not how better to express than by mental taste, the acts whereof (as the objects are suitable or unsuitable) are relishing or disrelishing, liking or disliking—and to say that to be more determined this way or that, is the certain sign or effect of a greater measure of grace and sanctity, were a great violation both of modesty and charity. I have not met with any that have appeared to live in more entire communion with God, in higher admiration of Him, in a pleasanter sense of His love, or in a more joyful expectation of eternal life, than some that have been wont with great delight publicly to worship God in the use of our Common Prayer; and others I have known as highly excelling in the same respects that could by no means relish it, but have always counted it insipid and nauseous. The like may be said of relishing or disrelishing sermons preached in a digested set of words, or with a more flowing freedom of speech.—Let us not be offended mutually with each other, for our different choice of this or that way, wherein we find most of real advantage and edification. Our greatest concern in this world, and which is common to us all, is the bettering of our spirits, and preparing them for a better world. Let no man be

displeased (especially of those who agree in all the substantials of the same holy religion) that another uses the same liberty in choosing the way most conducing in his experience to this great end, that he himself uses, expecting to do it without another man's offence.'

These counsels were worthy of Howe; but the Nonconformists at that time were hardly worthy to receive them. Internal dissensions set in as soon as external restraints were removed. The 'Heads of Agreement,' drawn up by Howe and others, between Presbyterians and Congregationalists did nothing but show how unripe the parties were for union. Into the wretched antinomian controversy which followed the reprinting of Dr. Crisp's works, Howe allowed himself unwisely to be drawn; but nobly redeemed himself by his discourses on 'The Carnality of Religious Contention,' the most philosophical and thoroughly evangelical treatise extant on the evils of theological contention. Then came the Pinner's Hall schism, which led to the establishment of the Salter's Hall lecture, at which Howe was one of the preachers. But it is refreshing to turn from these matters, which, however deeply they stirred the dissenting heart of that age, touched only the surface of Howe's spirit.

While these unseemly disputes were going on among his own people, Howe was watching the course of another controversy in the Establishment. The speculations of Wallis, Sherlock, South, and Cudworth embroiled theologians in that most awful of all disputes—the Trinitarian controversy. Howe contributed to it his celebrated *Calm and Sober Inquiry concerning the Possibility of a Trinity in the Godhead*. The point of this treatise is to prove that the idea of a Trinity involves nothing contradictory,—an attempt which is conducted in the humblest and most reverent spirit. It simply denies that the Divine unity is incompatible with *any* such distinctions in the mode of the Divine subsistence (unknown to us) as the doctrine of the Trinity requires. The following sentences give the pith of the whole, which is simply a defensive appeal in the style of Butler:—

'Such simplicity as shall exclude that distinction which shall appear necessary in the present case, is not by express Scripture anywhere ascribed to God; and therefore must be *rationally* demonstrated of Him, if it shall be judged to belong at all to Him. It is not a just consequence, that otherwise there would be a *composition* admitted in the Divine nature, which would impart an imperfection inconsistent with Deity. For, the several excellencies that concur in it (however distinguished) being never *put together*, nor having

ever existed apart, but in *eternal necessary union*, though they may make some sort of variety, import no proper composition, and carry with them more apparent perfection than absolute omnimodous simplicity can be conceived to do.'

The last controversy in which Howe engaged, when he had passed his threescore years and ten, respected 'Occasional Conformity.' Defoe was his chief antagonist, who uncharitably impeached the motives of Sir Thomas Abney, a member of Howe's congregation, in qualifying himself for the mayoralty of London by receiving the sacrament in a church. Passing by the controversy that arose, it may suffice to say that Howe was consistent to the last in his own moderation,—both practising and defending occasional communion with the Established Church. The following sentences from a letter found among his papers will show in what manner of spirit this Nonconformist left the world:—

'There have been also no inconsiderable numbers, in former and later times, that, though not entirely satisfied with our Reformation, were less severe in their judgment concerning the constitution and practice of the Established Church; that is, did not judge its reformation so defective that they might not communicate at all with it, nor so complete but that they ought to covet a communion more strictly agreeable to the Holy Scripture; and accordingly apprehended themselves to lie under a twofold obligation of conscience in reference hereto. 1. Not, by any means, totally to cut themselves off on the one hand from the communion of the Established Church, in which they found greater and more momentous things to be approved of, and embraced with great reverence and complacency (namely, all the true, noble essentials of Christian religion—not subverted, as among the Romanists, by any contrary doctrines or practices) than could be pretended to remain the matter of their disapprobation and dislike. 2. Nor, on the other hand, to decline other communion, which to the judgment of their conscience appeared, in some considerable instances, more agreeable to the Christian rule, and, to their experience, more conducing to their spiritual advantage and edification.'

The enemies of the Nonconformists strove in 1702 to place a check upon their too easy charity, by introducing the Bill against occasional conformity, which provided that, unless a man maintained constant communion with the Establishment, he could hold no civil office. This Bill passed the Commons, but was rejected in the Lords. During the discussion the following incident occurred, which we introduce as characteristic of the times, and of Howe's ascendancy over all men with whom he had to do:—

'As Howe was one day walking in St. James's Park, a noble lord, to whom he was well known, sent his footman to say that he desired to speak with him. When he came up, his lordship saluted him with much cordiality, and then entered into conversation on the obnoxious "Bill," which he assured Howe "he had opposed to the utmost." Gradually getting warm upon the subject, he so far forgot his company as to say, "Damn those wretches; for they are mad, and will bring us all into confusion." Howe calmly replied, "My lord, it is a great satisfaction to us, who in all affairs of this nature desire to look upwards, that there is a God who governs the world, to whom we can leave the scenes and events of things; and we are satisfied, and may thereupon be easy, that He will not fail, in due time, of making a suitable retribution to all, according to their present carriage. And the great Ruler of the world, my lord, has among other things also declared, that He will make a difference between him that *sweareth* and him that *feareth an oath*." His lordship was struck with Howe's reply, and, after a pause, said, "Sir, I thank you for your freedom: I shall endeavour to make a good use of it." Howe adroitly answered, "My lord, I have a great deal more reason to thank your lordship, for saving me the most difficult part of a discourse, which is the *application*."*

In 1702, in his seventy-second year, and fast failing in health, Howe published the second part of the *Living Temple*, the work on which his steadfast mind had been set through all the diversities and disquietudes of his long life. During the interval which had elapsed since the publication of the first part, the *Ethics of Spinoza* had contended for a naked pantheism, and Howe introduces his second part by an acute exhibition of the effect of this system. 'Spinoza's attempt to identify and deify all substance, attended with that strange pair of attributes, extension and thought, hath a manifest design to throw religion out of the world that way.' He then proceeds to recapitulate the contents of the first part, and approaches the book of Revelation. Referring to Grotius, Baxter, and

* Some other instances are on record of Howe's aptness in rebuking the profane swearing of the times. One day when he was dining in company with persons of note, a gentleman at table was expatiating at great length on the excellencies of Charles I. Howe, observing that he made free use of profane oaths, quietly remarked, 'that in his enumeration of the excellencies of the prince he had undertaken to panegyricize he had totally omitted *one*, which had been universally and justly ascribed to him.' The gentleman was delighted to find Mr. Howe a voucher for his praises, and 'was quite impatient to know what was the excellence which had escaped him.' Howe suffered him to press for the information awhile, and then told him that 'Charles was never known to utter an oath in his common conversation.' The gentleman bore the reproof well, and promised to reform. At another time, as he was walking along the street, he came up to two persons of rank who were disputing, and vehemently 'damning' each other. On this, Howe took off his hat, bowed to them with great courtesy, and said, 'I pray God *save* you both.' These also joined in thanking him.

Stillingfleet for arguments in favour of revealed truth, he enters on the sublime scheme of the Gospel for the restitution of the temple. The 'Temple in Ruins,' the depravity of man—the system of recovery devised by infinite wisdom and benevolence—the atonement of incarnate Messiah—the model temple of His character—the spiritual influences necessary for man's restoration to the likeness of that archetype—and the processes of its accomplishment—are the grand themes which, transcendental controversies being left behind, he expatiates upon with all the force and fertility of his mind, and all the impassioned fervour of a sanctified heart. Thus was completed a work which combines controversy, dogmatics, and practical appeal in a manner which scarcely has a parallel in theology.

His old companions in tribulation and patience were fast dropping away from him. He had preached the funeral sermons of several—sermons which rank amongst the sublimest and purest in that class of composition. He continued to labour, both in the pulpit and with the pen, almost to the end. A few weeks before his death, he published his last treatise, *On Patience in Expectation of Future Blessedness*—the perfect reflection of his own attitude as his departure drew near. His public engagements were attended by an extraordinary power and unction: 'once, in particular, at the communion, he was rapt into such an ecstasy of joy and peace, that both himself and his audience thought that he would have died under the strength of his emotions.' He received the visits of his friends day by day, who certified, what all will be ready to believe, that never did a man approach the gates of heaven with more of heaven in his soul. Among other visitors was the aged Richard Cromwell, who came to pay a last token of respect to his former servant and friend. 'There was a great deal of serious discourse between them; tears were freely shed on both sides; and the parting was very solemn, as I have been informed by one that was present on the occasion.' He expired on the second of April, 1705; and his funeral sermon was preached on the next Sunday, by his colleague, Mr. John Spademan.

We have sketched the outline of John Howe's career, and indicated the leading points of contact with the stirring events of the times in which he lived. The study of his life, and of his letters and writings, which this has required, has left the impression upon our mind, that a more finished character does not belong to English biography. He combined

in himself Christian qualities, of meditation and of action, which are very rarely found to co-exist. The devotion of his piety towards God, and the zeal of his charity towards men, were, so far as human estimate goes, perfect. Throughout a long career of diversified probation in revolutionary times, he maintained a communion with God which raised him as much above the world as is possible to man, and made supreme serenity seem the most characteristic feature of his life: while, on the other hand, he lived in the world of men, and acted his part (however sometimes unwillingly) in the religious politics of the time, with an integrity that never once was impeached, and a freedom from asceticism and bigotry that made Puritanism lovely to men who hated the very name of Puritan. John Smith did not contemplate the supreme beauty of holiness with a more devout and sustained adoration; Richard Baxter did not serve God in the salvation of men's souls with more self-sacrificing zeal. But no man of his age united these two types of the Christian life so harmoniously as John Howe.

The same completeness reigned in his mental character, as it is reflected in his works. No one faculty of the mind, no one attribute of genius, is either conspicuously present or conspicuously absent in his writings. His intellect, grappling with the metaphysics of theology, is at once wide in its range, and subtle in its penetration; and here he is the worthy companion of Cudworth, and Edwards, and Locke, leaving no region of the surface of his subject unexplored, and none of its depths unsounded or at least untried. His imagination, if not gorgeous, is sublime; there are few pages of his writings which are not lighted up by its glow. In this respect he sometimes suggests comparison with Milton and Jeremy Taylor; although oftener with the former than the latter. But his imagination is always held under strong repression, a repression which sometimes does injustice to its flights, and mars the rhythm of the sentences in which it would have delighted to flow. Fancy, the handmaid of imagination, he still more sternly repressed; and hence the conceits of Puritanical theology seem almost weeded from his pages. The graces of composition he almost invariably neglects. To this may be perhaps ascribed the comparative neglect—comparative that is to their superlative excellence—into which his writings have fallen;—although Professor Rogers' skilful management of the punctuation will do much to lessen the effects of this carelessness. As it respects the many other attributes of good theological writing,—such as originality of thought, logical analysis,

fertility of illustration, reverent vigour of speculation, tenderness of appeal, the enthusiastic utterance of the whole soul steeped in its theme,—the writings of John Howe are perfect and entire, wanting nothing.

The same attribute of completeness which stamps the man and the writer, marks also the character of his theology. The highest praise that can be given to the entire body of his theological writings—and he wrote nothing but theology—is that he is equally faithful to all the several spheres in which the revealed doctrines of our faith revolve. His teaching as a guide is comprehensive and thorough. The doctrines, the duties, the attainments of godliness, all have their full tribute paid them. This may be said of many of our great divines; but in one respect Howe has the pre-eminence over most, viz., in the beautiful harmony which his system exhibits between the doctrines which pertain to the foundation, and those which pertain to the superstructure, of the Christian religion. No writer in the whole compass of English divinity has set forth the doctrine of the atonement more fully and more explicitly; no writer has expatiated more transcendently upon the sanctified vision of God and the mysteries of the higher life. He is a minister of both courts in the great temple of revealed truth—the outer court, with its altar, and sacrifice, and blood, and the inner sanctuary, with its beatific vision of the glory that transforms—and in his writings, as in the work of Christ, the veil between is removed. He blends in a manner of which John Smith is the only other example in that age, what has been termed the Chrysostomian and the Augustinian theology. He is the Plato and Aristotle of divinity; or, to come to his own times, Owen and Lucas, combined. Some writers of that period keep us around the dogmatics of the cross as if they were almost insensible to the attraction of the inner sanctuary. Others, again, and our own times furnish many examples, admit their readers to the higher doctrines of redemption, without leading them through the court of sacrifice at all—entering in some other way. John Howe is one of the princes of that better theology which is at once always near the cross, and always in the Holiest. On this account, as well as for the sake of the elevating influence of his dignified and serene theology in general, we earnestly recommend all our young divines to read and to study the writings of this noblest and most luminous of the Puritan Divines.

- ART. V.—1. *Life in Mexico*. By MADAME CALDERON DE LA BARCA. Edited by W. H. PRESCOTT. London. 1845.
2. *Vagabond Life in Mexico*. By GABRIEL FERRY. London. 1856.
3. *Adventures in Mexico and the Rocky Mountains*. By GEORGE F. RUXTON. New York. 1848.
4. *History of the Conquest of Mexico*. By W. H. PRESCOTT. Fifth Edition. Three Vols. 1850.
5. *Mexico: the Country, History, and People*. Religious Tract Society. 1863.

THERE WAS an ingenious theory advanced by Hugh Miller, that the early geological history of a country was very often typical of its subsequent civil history. If its strata bore testimony of many and violent disturbances; 'if the trap-rock'—to use his own language—'had broken out from below, and tilted up its strata in a thousand abrupt angles, steep precipices, and yawning chasms, I found the chances as ten to one that there succeeded, when men came upon the scene, a history scarce less disturbed, of fierce wars, protracted sieges, and desperate battles. The stormy morning during which merely the angry elements had contended, I found succeeded, in almost every instance, by a stormy day maddened by the turmoil of human passion.' Perhaps hardly any portion of this globe would afford a more striking illustration of this idea than that rich but unhappy region of which we are about to write. The strange conformation of the Mexican table land, the sudden extrusion of volcanic rocks bursting out unexpectedly to the surface, the deeply rent barrancas, as the fissures are termed, which suddenly tear its rocks asunder and present a most serious obstacle to the formation of roads, the eccentric course of its rich veins of silver spreading out in a moment to a lode of surpassing wealth and then as suddenly disappearing, and the quaint forms which some of its mountains assume, such as the Coffre di Perote, and other basaltic elevations, all combine to form a geological history, which only finds a parallel in the civil condition of the country for many past generations. In the sudden and simultaneous upheaval of so vast a district as was affected by the rise of the cone of Jorullo, we may discern a type at least of the fiery passions which have from time to time burst out in Mexico, and changed the complexion of its politics; whilst the gradual cessation of volcanic agency has found its counterpart in the subsequent subsidence of exhausted energies, that have left behind them only the

dreary waste on which their destructive powers have been expended.

We are disposed to think that the public attention has hardly been so much directed to the present political condition of Mexico as the subject deserves. We are not, indeed, surprised at this; for the surpassing interest of the struggle which has followed the disruption of the United States, and the vast importance to our own countrymen of the issues involved in that stupendous conflict, have tended to concentrate the public thought upon that special portion of the American continent. It is true that a large amount of English capital has been invested in Mexican securities, (the word is a palpable misnomer,) as well as in the various companies formed about forty years ago to work its veins of silver; but, despite the accusation of being a nation of shopkeepers, it has always been found impossible to awaken England to any very lively concern in foreign affairs which only affect the pockets of its citizens. Nor are we about to enter upon a detailed account of the circumstances under which England and Spain withdrew from any further participation in the French invasion, nor of the successive steps by which the army of Napoleon has marched to the capital. We rather propose to present our readers with such a sketch of the country and its inhabitants as may enable them to form some judgment of its past condition and future prospects.

In a historic sense, Mexico is the oldest country of the new world. It is not merely that part of the American continent upon which the Spanish discoverers first formed a permanent settlement; but it possessed at the period of their arrival a fully organized empire, whose early records are more complete, and extend to a more remote antiquity, than those possessed by any other of the aboriginal peoples. The opinions of learned historians are, indeed, divided as to the value and accuracy of these early legends of Aztec civilisation; and of late years some rude assaults have been made upon the account so picturesquely detailed in Mr. Prescott's volumes of the luxury of Montezuma, and the manners of the nations beneath his sway. With all such objections we can only deal, as Dr. Arnold did with the destructive theories of Niebuhr and Beaufort: we may allow to some extent the force of their reasoning; but we cannot endure to be robbed of such a pleasing narrative. Nothing but the uncouth names of the actors could prevent the stories of Xolotl and Nezahualcoyotl from being as popular as the tale of Romulus or of Solon.

The physical geography of Mexico is almost unique. The

country is one vast table land, raised some seven thousand feet above the level of the sea, extending across the entire continent from the Pacific to the Atlantic Ocean, and stretching away in a northerly direction for many hundreds of miles. Along the coast there lies a narrow fringe of lowland, which sinks into a mere strip on the western shore. A large portion of the country lies beneath the torrid zone; but its great elevation causes it to enjoy all the blessings of a temperate climate. The fruits of every quarter of the globe abound in unexampled profusion, the atmosphere is of unsullied purity, and through its transparent medium the eye wanders over slopes of marvellous beauty until the view melts away in the boundless distance. The great plain in which the capital stands presents an almost unbroken decline for three hundred leagues together, varied only by a few giant volcanoes that do but serve to throw its rich and expansive beauty into stronger relief. In its present condition this vast plateau extorts the admiration of every visitor; but when clothed with the foliage of its primeval forests, with its fair lakes sparkling beneath the sun, and brilliant with the light flower-laden canoes of the Aztecs, it must have presented a vision of surpassing loveliness, and may well have recalled to the minds of the first Spanish invaders the fairest spots in their own sunny land.

The geological conformation of the country precludes Mexico from possessing many seaports; and Vera Cruz has hitherto monopolized almost the whole of its foreign trade. The city owes its origin to Hernando Cortez, and we must refer our readers to Mr. Prescott's pages for an account of the very characteristic circumstances under which its foundations were laid. The modern aspect of the place hardly corresponds with its past fame or its present importance. Its harbour is shallow and exposed to dangerous winds, which for six months almost cut off communication with the shore. During this season, the air is filled with sand, the sky is dark with clouds, the coast line is one unbroken sheet of foam, and the pedestrian can scarcely keep his feet, so great is the violence of the gusty winds. So pleasant a state of things alternates with an unhealthy season, in which the yellow fever rages and decimates those who are unacclimatized. 'What is that fog that overhangs the city?' asks the newly arrived stranger. 'Sir, it is the fever,' is the grave reply. Although lying beneath a burning sun, no measures are adopted to cleanse the streets of Vera Cruz, and filthy black vultures may be seen on all sides feeding upon the putrid carrion. It is hard to say whether it must be worse to be the victim of the gales from November to April, or

of the yellow fever from April to November. No wonder that none save a few merchants and some wretched natives are found to linger at the city of the dead.

As the level of the country rises between Vera Cruz and Mexico, the traveller enters upon the gorgeous and luxuriant vegetation of the tropics. The woods are alive with birds of gaudy plumage and noisy chatter, with cardinals, cat-birds, and macaws. Parrots swing lazily on pensile branches, and humming-birds hang, poised with murmuring wing, at the mouth of some favourite orchid blossom. Long parasites, such as the vanilla, hang in rich festoons, and laden with flower fall in garlands from lofty trees, or drop down into the water, as if to drink and carry life to the trunks that bear them. The cactus hedge, with its scarlet blossoms, blazes like a living wall of fire. The pools are black with water fowl; the air alive with insects, and at night radiant with fire-flies. But the picture has its reverse side. Amidst this sea of blazing foliage lurks the deadly fever, whilst mosquitos sally forth at even, and assault every inch of unprotected skin.

The elevation of Jalapa, some 4,300 feet, once reached, we are in the region of a salubrious climate, and a temperature of eternal spring. The yellow fever is unknown here, the extremes of heat and cold are never experienced, and, despite the misty atmosphere of the winter months, 'sickness is comparatively rare and seldom fatal.' The fruits of almost every region are produced in unparalleled profusion. Tobacco, coffee, sugar, corn, cotton, barley, wheat, jalap, sarsaparilla, vanilla, pine apples, oranges, citrons, lemons, pomegranates, peaches, apricots, guavas, and many others of less European notoriety, such as papayas, chirimoyas, and tunas, may all be raised at Jalapa. Mahogany, cedar, ebony, oak, dragon blood, palms, and dye woods are but representatives of its forest trees, many of which spring spontaneously from the soil. The unwary reader, however, must not suppose that all these products are cultivated. They might all be grown with much profit; but the Mexican has not energy enough to raise a crop for the foreign market. If you inquire why, the answer will be, 'Who knows? Who wants more than corn and chile?'

Almost all the historic interest of Mexico is centred round the capital. Around the shores of the five lakes which adorned the plain of Mexico, were gathered the earliest of the peoples who stamped their character upon succeeding ages. The Aztecs, who enjoyed the chief authority at the period of the Spanish conquest, had been preceded by an earlier race, the Chichimecs, under the rule of the wise Xolotl. We can only

dwell upon the story of one of his successors, in which the historical student will trace some remarkable analogies to the popular tales of the Eastern hemisphere.

Under the care of Xolotl's successors, so runs the legend, their capital city Tezcuco became the Athens of Anahuac; when suddenly a terrible reverse fell upon their nation in a contest with the Tepanecs. The city was taken, their king slain, and Nezahualcoyotl (the Hungry Fox) escaped by climbing a lofty tree. The young prince, however, soon after fell into the hands of his foes; but an old servant enabled him to escape from the dungeon in which he was confined. A brief interval of peace was followed by renewed hostilities, and no effort was spared that might insure his capture or his death.

Driven from the palace of his fathers, with a price set upon his head, the Hungry Fox led a wandering life of romantic interest. On one occasion he stole away through a subterranean passage whilst the soldiers sent to seize him were refreshing themselves at his invitation; on another he lay concealed within a drum, around which his foes were dancing quite unsuspecting that he was so near them; on a third occasion he was so hard pressed, that he was fain to get himself covered with the stalks of chian, which a maiden was reaping in the open field, and his pursuers were then sent off in a false direction. A large grant of land and a bride of noble birth were to be the guerdon of his capture; but no amount of bribe could tempt the poorest Tezcuacan to betray his prince. At length the oppression of the Tepanecs became intolerable, and the Hungry Fox was restored to his ancestral throne.

To this morning of hairbreadth escapes and perilous adventure there succeeded a noon-day of more than oriental prosperity and magnificence.

'The royal palace rose in the midst of the capital, extending for nearly three quarters of a mile in length, by more than half a mile in depth. It comprised two vast courts. The outer one served as the market-place of the city, whilst the inner one contained halls for the reception and entertainment of foreign embassies, and for the retreat of men of science and learning. Here, too, were gathered the literature and archives of the past; and authors assembled to pursue their studies, or to recite their compositions. Hard by were the royal apartments, and the saloons of the king's numerous concubines; their walls bright with alabaster, or gorgeous with hangings of feather work. These rooms opened into gardens laid out with much intricacy and beauty, dotted with fountains and baths of clear water, and enlivened by the plumage of tropical birds; whilst animals and birds that could not be brought there alive were skilfully modelled in gold and silver. Upwards of 400,000,000 of

pounds of maize, nearly 300,000,000 of pounds of cocoa, 8,000 turkeys, 1,300 baskets of salt, with game, vegetables, and condiments innumerable, were yearly supplied for the royal table. Nor is it at all incredible that the pile contained 300 apartments, some of them 50 yards square, when we read the accounts of the vast ruins that still attest the magnificence of the palace, or when we recall to mind that its remains have furnished the materials for all the churches and other buildings since erected at Tezcuco by the Spaniards.'—*Mexico: the Country, History, and People*, p. 35.

Amidst such splendour the Hungry Fox experienced all the weariness of satiety. At times he would seek for fresh adventure after the fashion of Haroun Alraschid, by wandering in disguise amongst his subjects, and thus becoming acquainted with their actual condition. Occasionally he would betake himself to poetry and the charms of literary composition; and his verses breathe the spirit of one who has drunk the cup of pleasure to the dregs, and yet has been unable to allay his thirst. But in an evil hour for his own good name, he indulged a guilty passion for the beautiful young wife of an aged noble; and after sacrificing the husband by the same stratagem that was employed against Uriah, he took the widow to himself. It was not until after long fasting and many prayers that the union thus cemented by crime was fruitful, and in the evil fortunes which befel his son we may trace the vengeance which rarely fails, sooner or later, to overtake iniquity.

This single illustration must serve to indicate the spirit of early Mexican legend. It will at once be seen how widely it differs from the fables which were current amongst the more northern tribes, and how great an advance in cultivation of mind and thought must have been reached by a people amongst whom such stories were current. By the time that the Spaniards reached the plateau of Anahuac the Tezcucan power had passed away, and their king had become a tributary to Montezuma.

With the arrival of Hernando Cortez at Mexico begins another act of the great drama of which this spot has been the scene. The strange impression that was produced upon the native mind by the entrance of the pale-faced warriors, whose appearance was hardly more astounding than the evolutions of their horses and the practice of their artillery—the unrivalled audacity and cunning of the conqueror in venturing thus to march into the heart of the enemy's stronghold, and to make himself master of Montezuma's person—the stormy scenes that followed, as the passions of the people were aroused by the ill-guided fanaticism of the Christians—and the terrible struggles

with all their exciting incidents of personal prowess and sad deadly conflict that marked the retreat of the Sorrowful Night—all these invest the capital of the Aztecs with abundant interest. Yet all these must yield in pathos to the story of the final catastrophe by which the fate of the city was determined.

It were no easy task to describe the condition of the Aztec capital in its palmy days. Doubtless there was much that would seem rude to our own more polished taste; but this was veiled under a barbaric splendour which modern times can hardly parallel. The city lay embosomed amidst the waters of the lake of Tezcuco, its streets not unfrequently intersected by canals and embellished with the brilliant colours of the flowers that bloomed on its floating gardens. Three causeways communicating with the shore each afforded a narrow path available to keep out invaders, or capable of being closed by a blockading army; whilst across the salt waters of the lake many flourishing cities lined the shores, from which canoes were ever darting forth to bring provisions to the capital. Three hundred thousand Aztecs were gathered within the walls of Mexico, who crowded its busy markets, or assembled at the spectacle of the solemn sacrifices. Such was the city which Hernando Cortez undertook to capture or destroy.

For some time the contest raged with varying fortunes. As long as the Mexicans retained their water communication uninterrupted, they were abundantly supplied with necessaries from the neighbouring towns, and suffered but little inconvenience from the Spanish occupation of the causeways. At length, however, Cortez launched his fleet of brigantines, and the blockade was complete. It was evident that the besieged must either cut their way out of the city, or else suffer all the horrors of famine; but a determined spirit of resistance was aroused. The proud Aztecs would rather die than yield.

‘The fiery cavaliers, however, were too impatient to await the effects of famine, and constant assaults were made upon the city on all sides. As the Spaniards advanced along the causeways, they were supported on either flank by the brigantines, whose fire swept across the path of the enemy. Still the Aztecs retreated in good order, and fiercely disputed the passage of every breach in the path. When the Spaniards reached the city, a fierce conflict arose at each one of the numerous canals by which many of the streets were intersected. Much delay, too, was caused by the Europeans being obliged to fill up each breach over which they passed in order to secure the line of their retreat. Several days were spent in such conflicts; but every night the Mexicans pulled away the mate-

rials with which the breaches were filled up, so that the work had to be begun all over again.'—*Mexico: the Country, &c.*, pp. 101, 102.

Such a mode of warfare might well dispirit the invaders. Some complained loudly against the folly of attempting so vast an enterprise with such scanty numbers. Others grumbled at the hardships of a struggle which brought much pain and little plunder; for from the cities they had already captured the gold had been removed or was buried. Ominous sounds too constantly fell upon their ears as the besieged taunted them with their avarice, and vowed that if defeated they would hide their treasure where the Spaniards should never find it. The invaders also suffered greatly from the inclemency of the weather, and from the scanty supplies which they could alone command. Under the pressure of these accumulated troubles a general assault was ordered, which had nearly proved fatal to the whole expedition. Cortez himself narrowly escaped destruction. Besides the killed and wounded, there were sixty-two Spaniards taken prisoners.

'A scene followed which filled the Spaniards with dismay. They were encamped so near the city, that in the clear atmosphere of the table land they could distinguish what was going forward in the lofty temples. Day by day after this disaster they beheld a solemn procession winding round the lofty pyramidal temple of the god of war. In the midst of the long file marched some of the white-faced strangers ready decked out for the sacrifice. They were urged along by blows until they mounted to the summit, where the victims, one by one, were seized, stripped, and laid upon the sacrificial stone. Then, in the sight of their countrymen, the priest struck the prisoner with the sharp stone razor, thrust his hand into the wound, and plucked out the palpitating heart, which he placed upon a golden altar. The body was then hurled down from the pyramid and seized upon, to be devoured by the crowd. These scenes were repeated daily, until all the captives had been slaughtered; and at each sacrifice the Aztecs shouted in defiance, that so should all the enemies of their country be consumed.'—*Ibid.*, pp. 103, 104.

Not only were the Spaniards much moved by these horrors, but the confidence of their native allies was sorely shaken. The spirit of the Aztecs, long accustomed to empire, rose with the danger, and no thought of escaping by a desperate sally and abandoning their capital seems to have occurred to them. The besiegers now drew nearer by regular approaches, ruthlessly levelling each quarter of which they got the mastery, and hemming in the wretched people into a more contracted space. Food began to fail the Aztecs. Their supply of fresh water

was cut off, and they had to drink the brackish water of the lake. Pestilence soon followed on the heels of famine, and mowed down such numbers that the survivors could not suffice to bury them. Dead corpses lay festering in the streets and houses to aggravate the misery of the sick, the wounded, and the dying. Yet in this terrible extremity they remained unsubdued in spirit, and rejected all entreaties to surrender. Gaunt and haggard creatures staggered through the streets, and rained showers of missiles that fell powerless from their enfeebled arms. At length, after a siege of more than three months, Mexico was taken. So deadly had been the struggle, that more than forty thousand had perished on a single day. The Spaniards had only obtained possession of a mass of ruins. The treasure had all been hurled into the lake. The palaces, the gardens, the menageries—all the pride of Aztec civilisation was lost for ever.

The fires that lay smouldering beneath its volcanic rocks could hardly have burst forth with more destructive fury than that which marked the Spanish conquest of the country. This tremendous civil earthquake was succeeded by a period of calm; but there were significant rumbling sounds heard from time to time which were indicative that the flames, though suppressed, were not subdued. The history of the country under Spanish viceroys has been almost a sealed book to English readers; but Mr. Mayer, in his *Mexico, Spanish, Aztec, and Republican*, has made the story known to his American countrymen, and a rapid sketch of the most salient points will be found in the comprehensive and excellent volume published by the Religious Tract Society. The policy of Spain towards its huge colony in North America may be broadly stated as a constant effort to get as much as possible for themselves out of the Mexicans, and to hinder any other Europeans from sharing the spoil. It is true that many philanthropic regulations were laid down by the home government, which seems to have been actuated by a sincere desire to protect the native races of Mexico, and to put some curb on the extortion and cruelty of the colonists; but the mother country was too distant and communication too difficult to enable it to exercise any great influence in ameliorating the condition of the Indians. There are dark secrets of lives worn out with labour in the mines, of fortunes drawn from the very life-blood of the subject peoples, and of deeds of satanic cruelty, which will never be disclosed, until the day when all things hidden are revealed. A legacy of hatred to their European masters was thus stored up which has not yet been exhausted,

and those habits of cowardice, faithlessness, and cunning were acquired, from whose effects Mexico is suffering at the present day.

The history of Spanish legislation for the treatment of the conquered races has been ably handled by Mr. Helps. From first to last the Dominican priests who accompanied the conquerors showed themselves the firm friends of the hapless Indians; but the avarice of the colonists proved superior to the efforts of the clergy. In 1544, the viceroy Sandoval arrived in Mexico with a royal ordinance, which enacted that no slaves should be made in the future wars; that the system of assigning bodies of slaves to each colonist should be abandoned; and that the Indians should not as a class be solely devoted to ignoble pursuits. Had the emperor adhered to this decision, the whole future history of Mexico would have assumed another complexion. But no engine was left untried to obtain the revocation of this decree, and in an evil hour a division of the royal domains was ordered, and the Indians upon them were transferred with the soil. Some thirty years after we find another viceroy, Alsanza, obliged to interfere, that he might secure for the wretched Indians 'regular hours of repose, and some time to breathe the fresh air on the surface of the earth.' Before this decree that toil had been incessant. Their taskmasters gave them no respite, and wrought 'as if they designed to scrape every vein and artery of the colony's soil.' Such cruelty had borne its wonted fruits in a terrible pestilence, under which the weakened frames of the Indians perished to the number of nearly two millions.

The following story will show to what extent intrigue and injustice frequently prevailed in the colonial government. The Marquis del Valle, the son of Hernando Cortez, had the misfortune to incur the displeasure of the Audiencia or Supreme Council which ruled Mexico in the absence of a viceroy. At the baptism of the twin daughters of the marquis a grand entertainment was given by two brothers named Alvarado, who were intimate friends of Don Martin Cortez; and amongst other things a masque was performed representing the first meeting of Cortez and Montezuma, the part of the Mexican emperor being played by one of the Alvarados, who, as he placed a diadem of laurel on the head of Martin Cortez, exclaimed, 'How well this crown befits your noble brow!' On so slight a foundation an accusation of treason was laid against Cortez and the Alvarados. They were thrown into prison, their papers seized, and, although no trace of any conspiracy was found, the Alvarados were executed, and the

Marquis del Valle was only saved from sharing their fate by the timely arrival of Peralta the new viceroy. Peralta soon discovered the iniquity of the whole proceeding, and penned a dispatch to Spain denouncing its authors. This dispatch the Audiencia not only managed to intercept, but actually sent in its place a charge against Peralta of providing an army of thirty thousand men to aid the marquis in his revolt. This fictitious instrument they confirmed by a batch of depositions. The home government, sorely puzzled, wrote to demand an explanation from Peralta; but this, too, the Audiencia intercepted, and as Peralta's silence was naturally construed into an admission of his guilt, another viceroy was sent out to supersede him. At length, after a delay of seven years, the whole truth came out; but during all this time the Marquis del Valle had been deprived of his property, which was sadly squandered by the crown officials.

Such a narrative will predispose the reader to believe other imputations upon the probity and wisdom of the Mexican authorities. Occasionally, as might have been anticipated, it was the viceroy himself who abused his power; at other times the council and the municipality paraded their incapacity and cruelty. The Audiencia more especially seldom failed when in supreme power to distinguish itself by some act of atrocity. This body seems to have lived in perpetual fear of a native insurrection; and one night during their tenure of office a great noise was heard, and a report soon spread that the Indians were marching on the capital. Inquiry showed that the alarm had been occasioned by a large drove of hogs; but the Audiencia, to justify their fears, had twenty-nine male and four female Indians put to death. 'Their dead bodies were left to hang upon the gallows, tainting the air and shocking the eyes of every passer by, until the neighbourhood could no longer bear the stench, and imperiously demanded their removal.'

We have a curious illustration of the Spanish government of Mexico in an old English volume which was written at the time of the Commonwealth. Its author, Father Gage, was a Dominican friar, who in company with some of the brethren of his order visited Mexico in 1625. Before the vessel sailed from the Spanish port, an order arrived from Madrid forbidding Gage to join in the expedition. The court of Spain was too jealous of any foreign influence in Mexico to permit even an English-born friar to enter the country. Gage, however, managed to conceal himself in an empty cask on board the ship, and did not come out from his hiding-place until they had been some days at sea. After visiting Mexico and Guatemala, Gage eventu-

ally found his way back to England, where he abjured Popery, adopted the tenets of the Puritans, and became chaplain to Fairfax. His thin folio, now very scarce, contains some curious particulars of the scenes which he witnessed, and abounds in variety of adventures which befel him by flood and field.

When Gage reached Mexico the Marquis Gelves was viceroy; and as he had come out with the intention, so common amongst the Spanish officials, of amassing a fortune as quickly as possible, and returning to spend it in the peninsula, Gelves hit upon the expedient of buying up all the corn in the country and selling it again at an advanced price. By the law of Mexico there was a fixed price at which corn was to be sold in years of famine; but the harvest had been good, and no apprehensions of scarcity existed. Suddenly, however, it became known that there were no stores of food except in the viceroy's granaries. A panic immediately followed, and prices rose enormously. The people then demanded that corn should be sold at the price fixed by law; but Gelves replied that it was not a year of famine, and refused to interfere. The archbishop tried to influence the viceroy, and when he still remained inflexible, Gelves himself was excommunicated, and the country placed under an interdict. At length a general insurrection broke out, and Gelves was obliged to yield. Of course both sides appealed to the home government. Gelves was recalled, but was made 'master of the horse' at the court of Madrid; whilst the noble-hearted archbishop was degraded to the petty diocese of Tamora in Castile.

We have not space to record the strange alternations of fortune through which the colony passed in succeeding years. The impression produced on the mind by the perusal of its history accords, though in a less violent degree, with the physical, geological convulsions to which we have already more than once referred. There were seasons of sudden prosperity, followed by as rapid a depression. At one moment the discovery of a rich vein of silver, such as the mines of Bolanos and Zacatecas, gave an unhealthy stimulus to enterprise. Thousands flocked to the mines with the wildest expectations of wealth. They hurried with feverish impatience from place to place, as rumours of yet richer findings reached them. Vast works were commenced, and a huge outlay incurred in spots where the ores suddenly failed and reduced the adventurers to beggary. In other instances penniless miners were raised to boundless wealth. Under such rapid oscillations of prosperity and adversity the collapse was generally as complete as the inflation had been unwarrantable. To these causes of disturbance others were not

wanting. Small-pox periodically devastated the colony. When the harvest failed, it was invariably discovered that no forethought had been exercised to provide food against such an emergency, although the country would easily have maintained a hundred times its population. There were terrible risings of the natives, with massacres on both sides, in which neither age nor sex was spared. There were seasons of pestilence in which thousands perished without attendance, medicine, or care.

It was no easy task to rule over a country which was so subject to disorganization, and the character of the people under the charge of the viceroy did but aggravate the difficulty of the task. The Spaniards, proud, avaricious, turbulent, paid but little heed to the orders of their chief, when those orders interfered with their rapid acquisition of a fortune; and at a short distance from the capital each colonist was practically independent of the governor. The fertility of the country and the heat of the climate indisposed the natives to exertion, and rendered them improvident; whilst, under the oppression to which they were subjected, the gentle but quick-tempered Indians became sullen, indolent, and revengeful. The exactions to which they were subjected by law were sufficiently onerous. They had to supply travellers with food and with porters to carry baggage, for which service they were not paid immediately, but the amount due was entered in the town's book, to be settled once a year; and of this tardy payment they were frequently defrauded. The burdens they carried were so heavy that when the strap by which it was slung across the forehead was removed, the skin not uncommonly came away with it. Each district was obliged to furnish a certain number of labourers to till the fields of the colonists; and under various pretences their wages were withheld, and at harvest-time they were glad even to bribe their taskmasters for permission to return home and gather in their own scanty crops. It was through years of such treatment that the hatred of the Mexicans for the very name of Spaniard was fostered until it became inveterate.

The policy of the home government, though commonly influenced by better motives, was not much more successful. These were the days of protection carried out to its fullest extent, and the fond solicitude of the paternal government nearly stifled its bantling. No ships were permitted to enter the harbours of Mexico, except those which had sailed from the ports of Seville or Cadiz. Not even a Spanish vessel might unload its freight upon the shores of Mexico, save in the inhospitable anchorage of Vera Cruz. All English goods had to be first carried to Spain, there landed, and then once more

shipped for the colony, so that the price was enhanced a hundredfold by the time the articles reached Mexico. So anxious was Spain to monopolize every available advantage, that the manufacture or cultivation of produce that could be made or procured in the Peninsula was forbidden in the colony. It was illegal to erect factories or to cultivate the olive and the vine. The trade so carefully nursed very naturally shrank to dwarfish proportions. When Seville enjoyed the exclusive commerce with Mexico, the whole amount of shipping employed did not exceed 28,000 tons, and many of the vessels only made a single voyage yearly. With a system of prohibitive duties three-fourths of the imports into Mexico were smuggled, and the custom-house officials were bribed to wink at the violation of a law which ordained death as the penalty for disobedience. It is unnecessary to say more of the enactments by which the inland revenues were arranged, than that they were in keeping with the regulations which crippled the foreign trade of Mexico. One important item of taxation is too characteristic to be passed over. It was that levied upon papal bulls.

These bulls were issued every two years, sent over to America from Spain, and sold by the priests, under the direction of a commissary appointed to superintend this branch of the revenue. They were of four kinds:—1st. The bull for the living, or *Bula de Cruzada*, so called because it has some traditionary connexion with the bulls of the Crusades. It was deemed essential for every person to possess this bull, and its virtues were innumerable. Whoever purchased it, might be absolved from all crimes, except heresy, by any priest; and of heresy he could hardly be suspected with this shield to protect him. On fast days he might eat anything but meat, and on other days he was exempted from many of the rigorous injunctions of the Church. Two of these bulls, *if they had been paid for*, communicated double the benefits of one. 2nd. *The bull for eating milk and eggs during Lent*. This was intended only for ecclesiastics, and persons not holding the first, which entitled the possessor to all the advantages of both. 3rd. *The bull of the dead*, *Bula de Defuntos*, which was indispensable to rescue departed souls from purgatory. It was bought by the relations of a deceased person, as soon as possible after death; and poor people were thrown into agonies of grief and lamentation if they were not able to purchase this passport for the spirit of a relative suffering the miseries of purgatory. 4th. *The bull of composition*, which released persons who had stolen goods from the obligation to restore them to the owner. One slight condition, it is true, was attached to this bull; which was, that the person when stealing had not been moved thereto by any forethought of the virtue of a bull to make the property his own, and his conscience white. Bating this small con-

dition, the bull converted all stolen goods into the true and lawful property of the thief. It had the power, moreover, to correct the moral offences of false weights and measures, tricks and frauds in trade, and, in short, all those little obliquities of principle and conduct to which swindlers resort to rob honest people of their possessions. "It assures to the purchaser," says Depons, "the absolute property in whatever he may have obtained by modes that ought to have conducted him to the gallows." The price of these bulls depended on the amount of goods stolen; but it is just to add, that only fifty of them could be taken by the same person in a year.—*Ibid.*, pp. 228-230.

The Spanish power in Mexico naturally came to an end when the Peninsula was overrun by the armies of Napoleon. But the ruling class was not disposed to yield its authority without a struggle. It had borne itself with excessive pride, excluding every Creole from any share in the government or the higher dignities of the Church; and Batallar, one of the imperial commissioners, had declared that a Castilian cobbler or a Manchego mule had more right to rule than the best native American. It was clear that a war of castes was imminent, and that it would rage with terrible fury. Once more the volcanic fires were ready to burst forth in an earthquake that should rend all Mexico asunder.

Hidalgo, curate of Dolores, was the first to raise the standard of revolt, around which the Indians gathered in thousands. On they came, inflamed with the passions engendered by years of oppression, and burning for revenge. Every European they met was sacrificed, and every Creole who hesitated to join their ranks shared the same fate. 'Their first advance was irresistible until some twenty thousand undisciplined and half-armed savages reached Guanaxuato, shouting, "Death to the Capuchinos."' The town refused to yield, but was carried by storm, and, despite the entreaties of Hidalgo, a general massacre ensued. For three days the carnage and destruction continued, until through very weariness the rebels held their hands. These excesses provoked a sanguinary reprisal as soon as the imperial forces under Calleja could make head against the insurgents. The latter retired from Mexico, suffered a disastrous defeat at Las Cruces, and thence fell back upon Guanaxuato, which again became the scene of the most revolting cruelties. 'The inhabitants of the town, men, women, and children, were driven into the great square of the town, and deliberately butchered. The great fountain flowed with human blood. Fourteen thousand perished in this way; and Calleja boasted in his dispatches that by cutting all their throats he had saved the expense of powder and shot.'

The subsequent history of the revolutionary wars reads almost like the pages of a blood-and-thunder tragedy. Scenes of atrocity and bloodshed, in which the royalists especially distinguished themselves, succeeded one another with terrible rapidity. As the conflict deepened in intensity, it soon became apparent that hatred of the Spaniards was the only animating principle of the insurgents; nor was it to be expected that a people trained up under the Spanish colonial system would prove either worthy or capable of liberty. Among the military chieftains who now assumed the direction of affairs, no man arose of such commanding talent as to insure the submission of his fellows. Personal jealousies split them into sections, around which each one ranged himself, as his interest or the humour of the moment inclined him. Nominally, indeed, there were two great parties:—the Federalists, who desired that the republic should be composed of a number of states, virtually independent of each other, on the model of the United States; and the Centralists, who were in favour of a single vast state, to be ruled from the capital; but the partisans of either side broke through every tie by which men can be bound together for common action. The wearisome narrative of endless intrigue and treachery recalls forcibly the terms in which Livy paints the character of Hannibal: '*Perfidia plusquam Punica, nullum jussurandum, nulla religio, nulla fides.*' Torres betrayed Mina. Iturbide first turned against the viceroy Apodaca the very forces with which he had been intrusted against the Republicans; then outwitted Guerrero, Bravo, and Victoria, the Republican leaders, and caused himself to be proclaimed emperor; and was finally himself betrayed by Santa Anna, whom he regarded as the most faithful of his supporters. This list of traitors might be greatly extended, if it were worth while to enter upon such details of petty chicanery and deceit.

Amid such a mass of faithlessness one incident of fidelity stands out in pleasing contrast. Guadalupe Victoria was one of the bravest of the Republican chieftains. He had first gained notoriety at the taking of Oaxaca, by swimming across the moat which surrounded the place, and, in the face of the enemy, cutting the ropes that held back the drawbridge, over which the Republican forces then marched into the town. Every inducement was held out to Victoria, to seduce him from the popular side. Rank and rewards were offered in return for his compliance; but in vain. A large force was then sent by the viceroy against him.

'His band was dispersed, and a price set upon his head; but none were base enough to betray him. For thirty months he wandered

amongst the recesses of the mountains, enduring incredible hardships. His food was the roots of trees, or the wild fruits of the forest, or even the bones of dead animals, which he found in caverns. His dress was torn away, till nothing but a tattered cotton wrapper was left him. In this condition he was found by two Indians, after the revolution of 1821, and he was welcomed as one risen from the dead; for the viceroy had been assured that he had perished, and that his body had been recognised. This account had been published by authority in the official gazette. The story of his discovery is no less remarkable. When abandoned by his forces in 1818, he was asked by two trusty Indians where they should look for him if better days should ever come, and in reply he pointed out a certain mountain on which they, perhaps, might one day find his bones. The Indians treasured up this hint, and when Iturbide declared himself, in 1821, they set out in quest of him. For six whole weeks they sought him, maintaining themselves principally by the chase; but at length their bread was exhausted, and they were about to return, when one of them, in crossing a ravine, which Victoria frequented, discovered the footprints of one who evidently had been accustomed to wear shoes, (this always gives a difference of shape to the foot,) and was, therefore, of European descent. Two days the Indian waited on the spot, and then, as provisions were failing him, he hung upon a tree all the little maize cakes he had in his wallet, and set out for his native village for more. He hoped that Victoria would see the tortillas, and would understand that some friend was in search of him. This plan succeeded. Victoria, on crossing the ravine two days afterwards, perceived the maize cakes, which the birds had fortunately not devoured. He had then been four whole days without eating, and upwards of two years without tasting bread; and he said himself, that he devoured the tortillas before the cravings of his appetite would allow him to reflect upon the singularity of finding them on the solitary spot, where he had never before seen any trace of a human being. He was at a loss to determine whether they had been left there by friend or foe; but, feeling sure that whoever left them intended to return, he concealed himself near the place. Within a short time the Indian returned: Victoria instantly recognised him, and abruptly started from his concealment, in order to welcome his faithful follower. But the man, terrified at seeing a phantom covered with hair, emaciated, and clothed only with an old cotton wrapper, advancing upon him, sword in hand, took to flight; and it was only on hearing himself repeatedly called by name that he recovered his composure sufficiently to recognise his old general.—*Robinson's Mexico and her Military Chieftains.*

We are unable to follow the fortunes of Morelos, or Mina, or Iturbide, each of whom in turn, after a brief career of prosperity, paid the penalty of their reverses on the scaffold; but any account of recent political movements in Mexico would be very incomplete without some notice of the career of

Santa Anna. This man was the son of a wealthy Creole, who possessed large estates on the road between Vera Cruz and the capital. At a very early age he raised a body of light cavalry, composed of the farmers and Indians upon his estates; and after distinguishing himself by his address and courage, he became an important supporter of Iturbide. Santa Anna's wealth, his handsome person, winning manners, and great command of language, all fitted him to be a party leader in Mexico: and as he was never troubled by any scruples of conscience, or by respect for his word, he entered with all the eagerness of a gambler upon the political game that was being played in his native land. He did not long remain faithful to Iturbide; and, upon his removal from power, Santa Anna was not more obedient to the Congress which assumed the direction of affairs. It was in vain that a superior force was sent against him. Santa Anna, thoroughly acquainted with the disposition of his fellow-countrymen, and fertile in resources, was the *beau idéal* of a guerilla chieftain; and when to the stratagems by which he had deluded the forces of the Congress he added the merit of outwitting the Spanish general Barradas, and freeing his country from the last army sent by Spain for its reconquest, his influence became predominant; and in May, 1833, he was elected president.

The history of Santa Anna for the next twenty-five years is the history of the Mexican republic. At his election to the presidency in 1833 he was avowedly a Federalist, next year he became a Centralist, broke with all his former allies, and dissolved the Congress, in which they had a majority. This *pronunciamiento* of Cuernavaca (as it was termed) first gave occasion for the interference of the United States in Texas, and afforded an excuse for the war by which that state was annexed to the American Confederacy. In the course of this war Santa Anna was taken prisoner. 'Sir,' he said to General Houston, on yielding up his sword, 'Yours is no common destiny. You have captured the Napoleon of the West.' Such bombast seems hardly in keeping with the address which persuaded the American general to let his wily captive go, on the promise that he would use his influence in Mexico to secure the recognition of the independence of Texas.

The disastrous issue of the struggle in Texas, whilst it fomented discontent among the populace, inspired the leaders of the Federalist party with hopes of recovering the authority of which Santa Anna had deprived them. They rose in insurrection in 1838, and Santa Anna was once more successfully opposed to them. Their leader Mexia was taken prisoner and

ordered to execution, with but an hour's respite, on the field of battle. 'Santa Anna is quite right,' said Mexia, when his fate was made known to him: 'I would not have given *him* half the time, if I had gained the day.' The influence thus regained was, however, destroyed by the reverses of the second war with the United States, in which Mexico was captured by General Scott; and Texas, California, and New Mexico were added to the American Union. The capital was occupied by General Scott in 1847, and the following year Santa Anna fled to Jamaica: but in 1852 he was recalled and made president with a centralist constitution; in the very next year he was appointed perpetual dictator, and was once more exiled in 1855. Between the years 1810 and 1860, 'no less than twenty-seven fundamental systems of law, or separate constitutions, have been enacted, and fifty-eight presidents have held the supreme power.' These uninteresting details are absolutely necessary to a comprehension of the actual posture of affairs. The great bulk of the people, supremely indifferent to all parties, have suffered from the passions of each in turn, and yet have failed to display the energy that should bring such anarchy to a close, and afford security to life and property. One traveller assures us that upon inquiring into the cause of some disturbance in the capital, he was quietly informed *that it was only a revolution*. The general confusion has at length reached such a height as to demand the intervention of the European powers.

The social condition of the country has of course been largely affected by its political vicissitudes; and amidst the changes that are constantly occurring it is difficult to give a picture of every-day life in Mexico which may not require modification in its lights and shadows. The capital itself presents a varied and magnificent panorama. The streets are broad and straight, running at right angles to one another, and opening out to spacious squares. Through the long line of houses the eye wanders in the clear atmosphere of the table land far beyond the city to the plain on which it stands, and across its gentle slopes to the rugged peaks of the Cordilleras or to the snow-clad cones of Popocatepetl and Iztacizhuatl, at whose feet lie two clear lakes which reflect the clouds upon their glassy surface. To the west stands the cumbrous pile of Chapultepec, the ancient viceregal palace, on a mountain girt with a forest of cedars some thousands of years old. 'Villages, steeples, and cupolas rise on all sides from the bottom of the valley. Dusty roads cross and recross one another like gold stripes on a green ground, or like runnels of water interbranching through the country;' whilst here and there a solitary

palm rises above the pale green foliage of the olives. If a bird's-eye view be taken of the city itself, an equally picturesque scene is presented. The flat roofs of the houses and many of the courtyards are filled with flowers, so that the whole area appears thickly carpeted with their blossoms. Churches with domes of yellow and blue tiling, houses with walls stained with various colours, balconies hung with striped cotton, and windows shaded with coloured blinds, not to mention the streets thronged with the varied and brilliant costumes of the country, all combine to form a *tout ensemble* of singular beauty. The great square is adorned by the majestic cathedral, by the palace of the president, an enormous range of buildings occupying the whole of one side, and by the flower market: and through it there circulates a flood of human beings, the type of Mexican society in its diversified phases of vice and virtue, of splendour and misery.

All day long the streets of Mexico resound with the cries of itinerant vendors, uttered in every imaginable discordant key. Almost at dawn you are aroused by the invitation to get up and purchase charcoal. Then comes the seller of Mantequilla lard, followed by the butcher with a cry of 'good salt beef,' neither of which delicacies can be particularly alluring, one would have thought, in a hot climate. The shouts of *Hay cebo-o-o-o-o* announce that the dealers in 'kitchen stuff' extend their operations to the Mexican capital, and offer the same temptations to unscrupulous servants as amongst ourselves: whereas the next cry is peculiar to the country, proclaiming the speaker's desire to exchange small fruits for pods of red pepper. Pedlars with wares of the most varied description, to be sold for a tenth of the price first asked; Indians with baskets of the most tempting fruit, oranges, granaditas, and bananas; sellers of little fat cakes all hot from the oven, inviting purchasers in a quick sharp tone to snap up their dainties before they cool; vendors of quesos or curds and honey, meringues and sweetmeats, in which the Mexicans excel; or of atolli, a drink made from maize—a sort of barley-water flavoured and coloured to every variety of hue—all solicit your custom: yet all offer a less powerful temptation to the lepero of the metropolis than the lottery man who holds up 'the last lottery ticket,' yet unsold, for 'half a real,' and assures you that it is certain to win the prize. If the street trade folk become somewhat quieter towards midday, the beggars become more noisy, and, with all manner of imprecation and entreaty, try to bully and coax the passer-by. At even the cries of business resume the ascendant. One shouts *Tortillas de cujada*,

another begs you to purchase nuts, and a third affectionately introduces his ducks to your notice: 'Ducks, O my darling, ducks!'

The costumes of those who throng the streets of Mexico are as diversified as the cries of its costermongers. Every variety of dress, accoutrement, and equipage, civil and religious, Indian and European, of the city and of the country, is intermingled in the crowd:—priests of every grade, from the lordly bishop to the poorest Creole pastor of some country village; monks, friars, and nuns, with the special dress of their several orders; Indian women in chemises of white and blue striped cotton, their naked feet often thrust into dirty white satin slippers; Indian men clothed in the *sarape*, a blanket with a hole in the centre, and dyed some bright colour; leperos clad in rags, porters clad with nothing save a pair of drawers or a cloth around the loins, and children clad in nothing at all. On fête-days the Indian population will appear in all their most gaudy finery, their long hair, rarely disturbed by a comb, adorned with a wreath of flowers. At such times, too, the peasantry of each district comes out in the costume of its department, and their dress will surpass, both in richness of material and picturesque combination of colour, the most effective dresses of the Swiss cantons.

The upper classes in Mexico have not many opportunities of appearing in full dress. The occasions are but seldom when any visits in our English sense of the word are paid, and dinner or evening parties seem to be almost unknown in Mexico. The national indolence engendered by the heat of the climate is fostered by the universal adoption of the *reboso*, a shawl which is worn over the head, and which conceals the untidiness of hair and garments in which Mexican ladies too commonly indulge throughout the morning. Many of them, indeed, advance a step further in disregard of the habits of civilised life, and receive their friends in the most complete dishabille. Almost the only opportunity for an elaborate display of finery is afforded by the arrival of some stranger at the capital. It is not the custom that new comers should wait for callers, if they desire to mix in society; but they send round cards announcing that Señor and Señora — inform you of their arrival in the city, and put themselves entirely at your disposal in the street of —. In reply to such an invitation, the Mexican lady of fashion pays a visit of etiquette in all her splendour; and the following description of a morning caller upon Madame Calderon will show that the *beau monde* of Mexico is quite equal to the emergency:—

'Dress of purple velvet, embroidered all over with flowers of white silk, short sleeves, and embroidered corsage; white satin shoes and *bas à jour*; a deep flounce of Mechlin appearing below the velvet dress, which was short. A mantilla of black blonde, fastened by three diamond vignettes. Diamond earrings of extraordinary value. A diamond necklace of immense value, and beautifully set. A necklace of pure pearls, valued at twenty thousand dollars. A diamond *séviigné*. A gold chain going three times round the neck, and touching the knees. On every finger two diamonds, like little watches. No Mexican lady has yet paid me her first morning visit without diamonds.'

This elaboration of costume is symbolical of the ceremonious formality which will ensue when the lady of the house comes into the presence of her visitor. Compliments will follow thick and fast as the jewels of the speaker. All the old Spanish parade is kept up, and is pronounced to be 'beyond measure tiresome.' The caller and the mistress commence some such interesting dialogue as the following: 'How are you? Are you well?' 'At your service; and you?' 'Without novelty, at your service.' 'I am rejoiced; and how are you, Señora?' 'At your disposal; and you?' 'A thousand thanks; and the Señor?' 'At your service, without novelty.' This interchange lasts for some time, and is applied to all the other members of the family. At its conclusion the sofa is reached, and a contest of politeness begins as to which should first be seated. 'Nay, you pass first, señorita.' 'No, madam, you go first;' such remarks being plentifully interspersed with such assertions as, 'I dislike all ceremony,' and other equally suitable comments. Probably a compromise is effected by both sitting down at once, when affectionate inquiries recommence. 'How have you passed the night?' 'In your service.' The visit over, both parties open fire again, and the endless repetitions are faithfully re-executed. Such visits of etiquette alternate with friendly calls paid at all hours by gentlemen, who look in, join in any meal which may occur in its course, walk out with you, and return home, perhaps, to spend the evening. There is an easy explanation, both of this elaborate ceremony and the more inconvenient disregard of it—the Mexicans have no better method of employing the time thus wasted.

The ordinary phrase of politeness takes the form, 'It is at your disposal.' Marriages are announced by a printed note informing you that Señor A. and Señora B. have contracted matrimony, and have the honour of placing themselves at your disposal. The birth of an infant will be made known to you by a message from the mother, sending her compliments, and

she has another servant at your disposal. If you admire anything, you will immediately be told it is at your disposal. Foreigners sometimes complain of the insincerity of this expression, which means nothing more than 'yours truly' at the end of a letter, and Mexicans have been equally indignant at being occasionally taken at their word. A story is told of a Frenchman's calling upon a friend in Mexico, whom he found unpacking a beautiful new set of harness which had just arrived from England. The French gentleman expressed his admiration of the purchase, and received the usual answer, 'It is entirely at your disposal.' 'A thousand thanks,' said the Frenchman; 'I hardly know whether I can carry it under my cloak;' but he managed to do so, much to the mortification of the Mexican.

Servants are the causes of much trouble to foreigners in Mexico. The natives are too indolent or too indifferent to make careful inquiry into the character of any applicant for a situation, and advantage is often taken of this by thieves, to effect robberies on an extensive scale. The lower classes in Mexico are good-humoured and polite, but excessively idle; and as soon as a female servant has laid by enough to purchase a chemise trimmed with lace, and a pair of second-hand white satin slippers, she will generally give up her place in order to rest herself, and to enjoy her finery. A woman who had been engaged at liberal wages to do washing, left her post, and a very short time afterwards came to beg of Madame Calderon. 'Why did you not keep in your place?' was the very natural inquiry. 'Good heavens, if you only knew the luxury of doing nothing!' was the reply. Another example of servant-girlism is mentioned by the same authoress. She had taken a young girl, whose family were in great poverty, that she might train her up into a really good servant. Josefita behaved pretty well generally, but once a week she was visited by her mother, a tall slatternly woman with long matted hair trailing down her back, and a cigar in her mouth; and accompanied by a number of friends, and a tribe of children. The whole party would get some dinner from the housekeeper, and then, all lighting their cigars, would sit and howl in chorus over the hard fate of Josefita in having to go to service. It will easily be understood that after such visits Josefita was good for nothing. At last she went one day to see her mother, and, instead of returning, a dirty note was dispatched, saying she was fatigued, and required 'to rest herself.' The number of domestics located in the roomy dwellings of Mexico is often considerable; including coachmen, footmen, gardeners, porters, and all their wives and children.

Education is at the lowest ebb. Very few of the ladies are able to write correctly or well, and many of the sterner sex are not much more accomplished. The schools are commonly of a very inferior character; and for a really good education, children must be sent to the United States or to Europe. National Mexican literature there is none. Newspapers are unknown, save through the solitary and very dreary example of the official Gazette, which appears at irregular intervals. Periodical literature was until very recently represented by a single Magazine, containing some reproductions of foreign papers, and a few native articles of very slender merit. Children are permitted to discontinue their lessons at a very early age. One lady, on being asked if her daughter went to school, replied, quite shocked, 'O dear, no! she is past eleven years old.' After this age, there are very few that read a book through from one year's end to another.

How do they manage to get through the day? We fear the proverbial saying, that Satan finds employment for idle hands, is but too often verified in Mexico. Despite their lack of education and their ignorance of the most ordinary matters, the Mexican ladies have to perfection the art of making themselves agreeable. Never awkward, always self-possessed, often graceful, with their sparkling eyes and warm temperament, they are the most accomplished of flirts; and so dangerous an accomplishment frequently produces the most painful consequence. A lax system of morality is fostered by their indolence, by the freedom with which they associate with the other sex, and by their fidelity to one another. After a morning spent in lounging on the sofa in the extremest undress, the Mexican lady drives at four o'clock to the Alameda and the Paseo, (which form the Hyde Park of the city,) dressed in the Spanish mantilla, and waving her fan with the inimitable grace of the daughters of the Peninsula. A motley scene is presented of elegant carriages of modern design mingled with the lumbering old-fashioned coaches, swung on huge leathern springs of a past age. Horsemen prance among the crowd, in tight-fitting jackets all alive with buttons and bullion; their saddles like those used by our James the First, with a pommel and cantle of silver, their toes just touching the silver stirrup which hangs behind the girths. And amidst the throng the work of intrigue and flirtation is carried on with unremitting energy. The fashionable hour for departure arrives, and the *beau monde* of Mexico returns home; the afternoon drive is commonly followed by a late evening promenade, which an eye-witness shall describe for himself:—

'The crowd upon the Plaza Mayor was not so dense as before sunset; it was less noisy and more scattered. The promenaders spoke in a low tone, as if they feared to break the silence which was brooding over all. The light noises produced by the waving of fans, the rustle of silk dresses, sometimes a peal of female laughter, melodious and clear as the tone of a crystal bell, or the striking of a church clock at a distance, alone broke the general silence. Veiled women, and men wrapped in long cloaks, glided like shadows over the sand, that hardly crunched beneath their treads. I saw more than one mysterious couple, whose appearance there would probably furnish dainty food to the scandal-loving denizens of the drawing-room.'—*Vagabond Life in Mexico*, pp. 132, 133.

We are not going to sully the reputation of a community on the unsupported evidence of a solitary writer, whose own taste may not be altogether disinclined to relish scandal: but the unanimous testimony of travellers leaves no question that beneath an outward covering of decorum a fearful amount of immorality prevails.

The leperos form a special class at Mexico, answering to the lazzaroni of Naples. Always in rags, swarming with vermin, subsisting alternately by beggary and by crime, the lepero is the strangest item of Mexican society. He can sometimes be induced to work, if the labour be short and the pay immediate. He will carry a message or a parcel, and with equal readiness will plunge a dagger into any man's heart to avenge another's quarrel or his own. In short, the lepero is the most fearful example of the degradation that results from the unchecked passions of civilisation and of savage life combined. It is hard to describe the condition of these people without incurring suspicion of exaggeration. 'At times,' says the writer of *Mexico: the Country, History, and People*, 'when their excesses become intolerable, they are suddenly repressed, with but little regard to the forms of justice; but in most cases it is quite useless to apply to the police, who are either their accomplices, or fear the vengeance of their associates. In 1845 an address was presented to the municipality about certain thieves who exercised their calling in mid-day—the complaint being not so much of the crime itself as of the time chosen for its performance.' Still worse is their utter disregard for human life. Assassination in the streets is a matter of every-day occurrence, and is committed without any interference from the bystanders, or any attempt to apprehend the murderer; and a dying lepero will confess with much contrition his neglect of some superstition, but will express small compunction about the commission of a murder.

Travelling in Mexico is performed by public diligence or on the backs of mules. The roads are villanous, and are infested in every direction by highwaymen, who plunder the passengers, and often murder those who offer any resistance. All the way from Vera Cruz to Mexico the road is dotted with crosses that mark the spot on which some deed of violence has been performed. The universal inquiry, 'What is the news?' means, Have you heard anything about the robbers? and the same cheering topic is the staple of conversation in the public coaches. Numbers of disbanded soldiers, whose pay is generally in arrear, take to the road for a livelihood, and the Mexicans submit to their exactions without a thought of resistance. Occasionally, when Europeans are amongst the travellers, a struggle ensues in which the bandits come off second best; but more commonly a whole coach-load will fall upon their faces as directed, and lie quietly until they have been stripped by a single marauder. With the strange fascination which horrors commonly possess over the minds of the timid, the passengers recount the minute details of any outrages that have been accompanied by some especial enormity, and the coachman will put his head in at intervals, with the comfortable suggestion, 'Look to your arms: we are now in a very dangerous spot.' The less-frequented roads are commonly of the roughest character, and much expensive machinery imported from England for the silver mines broke down in its transit, and never reached its destination. In some districts there is only a bridle path, which is too narrow to admit of one mule's passing another; and should a single animal in the train fall down, all behind him have to wait until he can be got up again. As the northern frontier is approached, the peril of life and property becomes greater. The wild Indian tribes sweep off everything they can lay hands upon, and scalp any unprotected traveller. They regard every civilised man as their enemy; and to so great a height have they carried their audacity that almost beneath the walls of Chihuahua Mr. Froebel saw sheep grazing under the protection of artillery.

The inns are quite in keeping with the roads.

'They are everywhere the same in form. A large corral or yard, entered by a huge gateway, is surrounded by some half a dozen square rooms without windows or furniture. In one corner is generally a stone platform, raised about three feet from the floor of clay. This is the bed. A little deal table is sometimes furnished, if demanded. In one corner of the corral is the *cocina*, the kitchen, so called—*lucus a non lucendo*—from the fact that nothing is cooked there; and in the outer yard is the stable, with a well in the centre. The

mules are unpacked, and the baggage secured in one of the rooms destined for the masters; the saddles, &c., are placed in another occupied by the servants. On entering, the muleteer shouts for the landlord, who makes his appearance armed with the key of the granary. He condescends to serve out the straw and barley or maize, all of which is duly weighed. The following conversation then takes place with the landlord. *Muleteer*.—"What is there to eat?" *Landlord*.—"Ah, my lord, there is nothing here." *Muleteer*.—"Heaven defend us, what a country we have come to!" *Landlord*.—"It is true, my lord, it is a very poor country." *Muleteer*.—"But what are we to do? The gentlemen are dying of hunger." *Landlord*.—"Well, if their worships like it, they can have a fowl and frijoles, and red pepper and tortillas." *Muleteer*.—"Capital, my friend; let them be prepared."—*Vagabond Life in Mexico*, pp. 63, 64.

This is a very fortunate issue; but the unwary traveller must not venture to ask for too much. A demand for water and a towel will excite a torrent of wrath. The landlord never imagines that it is his business to make his guests comfortable, or to give them any information, or to do anything for them except to relieve them of their money.

Country life in Mexico betokens the same decay which has fallen everywhere upon this unhappy land. The estates are for the most part divided into immense farms of many square miles in extent, over which wild cattle roam by thousands, and which might produce crops in endless variety. In the best days of the Spanish rule the country-houses of the wealthier colonists were the scenes of profuse hospitality, and the tables groaned beneath the abundance of the good things placed upon them. But all this has passed away. On arrival at a hacienda the owner will probably be found lying in his hammock, swung under a tree, and will rise in his shirt to receive your letter of introduction. Strangers are generally free to stay as long as they please; but the inducements to a protracted sojourn are few indeed. There will be plenty of cows, but neither butter, cheese, nor milk; plenty of oxen, but no beef; plenty of wild fowl, but no game served up to table, unless you shoot it yourself, and then the cook will very probably consume the best parts in the kitchen. The evening will be spent in shelling corn, and the night in lying on an ox-hide swung by strings from a frame in the wall of the open piazza. The same place often serves as the bed-room of the family, and during the night the clicking of flint and steel will cause the stranger to open his eyes, when he will perhaps see one of the young ladies of the house wiling away a sleepless hour with a cigar. If there

be many guests, the ropes must be left loose to accommodate the numbers, and each one will lie curiously doubled up, his heels as high as his head, and his body sinking down in the middle.

There is no exhaustive account of the fauna and flora of Mexico extant. The magnificent folios of Audubon and Gould comprise many individual specimens of its ornithology; and the former naturalist, in conjunction with Bachmann, has given illustrations of the mammalia of North America, which include some Mexican animals. In the *Essai Politique* of Humboldt full details will be found of the cereals and other products of chief commercial importance; whilst certain orchids and other plants are described in the volumes of other authors. But we are not aware that any great naturalist has devoted himself especially to Mexico, and we believe that a vast harvest of interest and fame yet remains to be reaped in that country.

Mexico is the land of flowers, and its Indian population still retains the same fondness for them which was displayed by the earliest inhabitants. The freights of the canoes that glide across the lake of Mexico are strewn with them; the lazy Indian, who will hardly attend to his crop of maize, tenderly cherishes a few flowers around his cabin, and on fête-days the altars of the saints and the brows of their worshippers are both adorned with garlands, as the priests and victims at the human sacrifices were in the days of Montezuma. Amongst the most characteristic genera the first named should be the orchid, with its strange habits, its brilliant colouring, and its grotesque and beautiful forms. The *Oncidium ornithorhyncum*, so called from its resemblance to a swan, the pink flower forming the body and its stalk the graceful arched neck of the bird, and having the scent of fresh hay; the *Cyrtorchilum Bictoniense*, with a long spear-like stem adorned with purple or rose-coloured blossoms; Barker's *Peristeria*, found in a dark ravine near Jalapa, one of the strange paradoxical creatures whose stems issue from the bottom of its bulbs and stretch downwards for two feet in length, sprouting with globose yellow flowers;—these are perhaps the most important species. Nor should we omit to mention the masses of golden blossoms of the *Epidendrum aurantiacum*, the *Mor pardina*, so called from its likeness to a leopard, and the *Lælia autumnale*, commonly known in Mexico as the 'Flower of the Saints.' Abundant parasites hang in garlands from the trees, amongst which the vanilla, with its star-shaped blossoms, is conspicuous; whilst the scarlet blooms of the cacti blaze from hedges that look like a wall of fire.

We have already mentioned some of the trees and fruits that may be produced in the district of Jalapa; and to give a complete catalogue of the plants which will flourish in Mexico, would be to reproduce the botanical dictionary. The cacao tree, from whose fruit chocolate is manufactured, is indigenous to Mexico, although now largely cultivated in other lands; and it is amusing to read Friar Gage's recommendation to his countrymen about an article of such commercial importance at the present day. He urges the English not to slight it 'so much as we and the Hollanders have often done upon the Indian seas; of whom I have heard the Spaniards say, that when we have taken a good prize, a ship laden with cacao, in anger and wrath we have hurled overboard this good commodity.' When a cacao plantation is being formed, it is customary to, plant an erythrina or coral tree by the side of each cacao tree, to protect it from the sun's rays; and as the erythrina attains a height of sixty feet, and in April throws out a multitude of bright crimson flowers, the plantation at that season is singularly beautiful. It is not until after seven or eight years that the cacao tree begins to bear, and, as time and capital are both requisite, its cultivation is much neglected now in Mexico; but where an estate is once established, it is easily enlarged, and one man can tend and gather the harvest from a thousand trees. There is hardly any limit to the quantity of chocolate that might be raised in Mexico.

Another important item of commerce is the cochineal insect, which feeds upon certain varieties of the cactus. The Spaniards found the dye in use among the Aztecs, and exported it to Europe. The habits and cultivation of the cochineal have been made too familiar in the pages of Kirby and Spence to require more than a passing mention. Another insect, the locust, is the bane of Mexico. Its ravages happily only occur at intervals. So universal is the devastation occasioned by its columns, that in a single hour the largest maize fields are stripped of their leaves. 'We are the army of the great God,' said the locust to Mahomet; 'we produce ninety-nine eggs: were the hundredth completed, we should consume the whole earth.' Among the lesser ills that flesh in Mexico is heir to, we may mention the *chigoes*, small fleas which bury themselves beneath the skin, and produce painful ulcers, if not speedily extracted.

The quadrupeds indigenous to the country are neither numerous nor important, if we except the buffalo, which wanders in thousands on the northern frontier. The jaguar, the puma, two or three kinds of deer, the opossum, the racoon,

and the marmot, are the principal mammalia. The horse was unknown when Cortez landed on its shores; and the first accounts which reached Montezuma of the Spaniards represented their cavalry as centaurs, the horse and his rider forming parts of the same animal. As the caravans journey across the prairies that stretch between Mexico and the United States, they come upon buffaloes in incredible numbers. M. Froebel asserts that on one occasion the herds formed a close line at least eight miles in length, and estimated to comprise some millions of animals. Serious inconvenience is frequently caused by meeting these huge droves, as all the pasture is consumed for leagues together. Although wandering in bands, they never offer any combined resistance, and the huntsman selects the most promising individual, and shoots it with impunity. The tongues, the marrow, and the liver of the calves are alone deemed suitable food for Europeans.

The marmot is a denizen of the prairie, with yet more sociable propensities than the buffalo. The prairie marmots not only form their dwellings near to one another, and in such numbers as to extend over some square miles, but they permit other creatures to share their homes. On approaching a marmot village, M. Froebel saw a quantity of little owlets, some hurrying into the holes, others demurely keeping watch at the entrance. Rattlesnakes are also fellow-lodgers with the owlets, and repay the kindness of their host by relieving him from a too numerous progeny.

The birds of Mexico are more numerous than the beasts. Thousands of macaws, parrots, and toucans, make the forest resplendent with their brilliant plumage, and the air resonant with their inharmonious notes. Water-fowl and waders in endless variety crowd the pools. Vultures and eagles wheel in the air, and descend in troops upon the carrion. Cardinals and catbirds dart through the woods, and quails and partridges run timidly amongst the herbage. Little green chocollitos and love-birds perch affectionately side by side, and the ravine-bird, the guarda-barranca, an exquisite creature of greenish blue, with a forked tail of two long feathers, glances in the dark basaltic gullies. But the pride of Mexican ornithology, the delight of naturalists, is the humming-bird, of which more than forty varieties are known in Mexico. In the most arid regions where the silver ore is wrought, the humming-birds are unusually brilliant and glittering, as though some portion of their lustre were due to the precious metals that enrich the soil. Space fails us to dilate upon their beauties. The names of flame-bearer, coquette, cacique, sabre-wing, Tyrian tail, blue

throat, purple throat, ruby throat, star throat, azure crown, garnet, sparkling tail, and violet ear, will serve to indicate their varied characteristics.

We pass from the animal to the mineral kingdom, but can only glance at the silver mines of Mexico, which would need a separate article for their adequate treatment. The same strange alternations of enormous wealth and beggary, the same feverish excitement hurrying away many from actual prosperity to ruin in their haste to become rich, the same sudden and most unexpected failure of veins that had promised boundless profits, which mark the story of mining adventure elsewhere, are found in the history of the Mexican mines of silver. The fabled treasures of Aladdin's lamp were realised in the lodes of Guanajuato, Catorce, and Zacatecas. Despite a most imperfect and expensive system of extracting the precious metals, and the absence of such scientific knowledge and mechanical appliance as should fully test the capacity of the mines, the value of their produce from 1690 to 1803 is estimated at £284,000,000 sterling. The fortunes amassed by Obregon, Tereros, and Laborde, each of whom started with but a small borrowed capital, might vie with the wealthiest of our merchant princes. The Valenciana mine, worked by M. Obregon for forty years, never yielded less than from £80,000 to £124,000 per annum, and on some occasions the nett profit reached £250,000. With the establishment of the Republic, and the consequent opening of the country, it was expected that every opportunity would be afforded for a more efficient working of the ores. Numerous companies were formed in England and America, large quantities of machinery were sent out, and Cornish miners were induced by the promise of large wages to transport their superior skill to the mines of Mexico. Whatever success may have attended individual speculations, these attempts, taken as a whole, have proved a gigantic failure. Some of the machinery never reached its destination; other portions were found unsuited to the work, or failed for lack of the requisite fuel. The Cornishmen proved utterly unmanageable, and had to be sent back to England. And the general insecurity of life and property discouraged the miners from arduous exertions, of whose uncertain fruits they might after all be despoiled. At present only a few poor labourers work among the refuse of the ores, thus earning a scanty pittance, which is generally spent in gambling. 'Will Don B. pay me?' asks one man of business in confidence of another. 'Yes, I think he will; he won 5,000 peros yesterday,' is the kind of reply.

Superstition in its darkest form prevails throughout the country.

The rites and practices of the Romish Church degenerate in the Indian villages into scenes that are only worthy of the grossest paganism. In the capital, dirt reigns predominant in all public places, but its head quarters are the cathedral; and so filthy are the churches generally, that the upper classes only enter them once or twice a year. In every mansion of any pretension a room is fitted up as a chapel, and service is performed in it for the benefit of the family. Among the most remarkable ceremonies of the year are the processions through the city in the holy week, when figures, as large as life, of the apostles and of the other actors in the solemn scene of Calvary are borne along. The Saturday before Easter is devoted to the explosion of a quantity of fireworks called Judases. In the villages there still lingers a remnant of the old mystery plays; the parts of Caiaphas, Judas, and others are performed by actors who are bribed patiently to endure the cuffs and blows that are plentifully showered upon them by the faithful. Occasionally, however, their powers of endurance become exhausted, and a general fight ensues. It is yet more painful to read that the sacred person of the Saviour is caricatured in like manner by an Indian crowned with a wreath of bulrushes, and clad in a tattered purple robe.

We have utterly failed of our purpose in this paper, if our readers be not able to form some judgment for themselves as to the future prospects of Mexico. Strange as are the facts which we have been recording, their truth is seen in the change which has come over public opinion in Europe as to the value of this highly fertile but distracted land. The country whose possession was at one time more coveted than any save the Eastern Indies—the country whose natural advantages probably excel those of any other quarter of the world, whose fields might produce crops infinite in abundance and variety, whose fruits might maintain a population numerous as the sands, whose rocks are rich in treasures so vast that the gold fields of Australia alone rival them in value—this country, once justly regarded as the richest jewel in the Spanish crown, and from whose shores galleons used to sail so richly laden that the capture of one of them by our admirals was regarded as a national benefit,—this country we have without a murmur permitted to fall into the hands of the French emperor; whilst the English press, which is neither slow to perceive nor backward to fan our national jealousy of France, has almost universally expressed its satisfaction alike at the withdrawal of the English quota to the expedition, and at the perseverance of the French in their arduous undertaking.

The difficulties of the French occupation are, however, only just commencing, and probably the least hazardous portion of their task was the nominal conquest of the country. To the well-trained legions led by Marshal Forey, the Mexicans could oppose but a sorry armament: but the natives, as proud as they are incapable, have always evinced a most bigoted contempt for foreigners. The resistance which was powerless against the French troops in regular warfare, may prove most seriously distressing to the invaders, should a system of guerilla strategy be adopted, such as that which the Spaniards maintained in the Peninsula against the first Napoleon. At present, there are no signs to indicate that the people have really acquiesced in the election of the Austrian archduke; and we have become too well acquainted with the manipulation of the ballot box in the hands of our Gallic ally to place any implicit confidence in an election which has been marked by so suspicious a unanimity. The latest accounts give evidence that the French are already beginning to realise the perplexities in which they have involved themselves. They are said to hold no authority whatever in the country, save upon those spots whereon their troops are concentrated; and possibly the only chance of awakening a national spirit in the Mexicans, and uniting them into one individual people, may be found in their being rallied around some native chieftain who shall gain a name for successful partisan warfare against the foe.

There is, however, but a remote prospect of such a contingency, and we hardly know on what ground any hope for the future amelioration of Mexico. When things come to the worst, they will mend: so says the adage; and it at least is so far true, as it recognises the merciful interposition of the providence of God to rescue men and nations from the lowest depths of degradation. There is a power in the word of truth to influence the hearts of men, not merely to their eternal welfare, but also to promote those principles by which alone communities are bound together. With the introduction of Europeans to the country, we hope that entrance may be made for the Bible, which has been hitherto unknown in Mexico. At present, in the language of one of the works before us, we can only 'mourn over the sad prospects of a country possessed of every natural advantage, but in the dark horizon of whose religious condition there breaks forth no single ray of light. Yet, above the policy of rulers, and the ignorance of nations, the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth, and in His own time and way He may be pleased to reveal His truth to this now benighted land.'

- ART. VI.—1. *Novum Organon Renovatum*. By WILLIAM WHEWELL, D.D. Being the Second Part of the *Philosophy of the Inductive Sciences*. Third Edition. London: Parker. 1858.
2. *A System of Logic, Ratiocinative and Inductive: being a connected View of the Principles of Evidence, and the Methods of Scientific Investigation*. By JOHN STUART MILL. 2 Vols. Fifth Edition. London: Parker. 1862.

It is often thought, and has been intimated by more than one popular writer, that a special scientific terminology is unnecessary, and that it even retards the progress of science, by deterring from its pursuit many who would, but for the difficulty thus presented, be valuable recruits to the corps of scientific observers. With regard to the interests of science itself, this view seems scarcely to require refutation. Real, downright science is not an easy thing. To observe well requires an intelligent, educated, and cautious eye; to form scientific inductions to any purpose, requires very high intellectual and, we may almost say, moral qualities; and a person who is inadequate, either in power, self-control, or perseverance, to the mastery of what is, after all, not a *very* large number of technical terms, is not likely to add much to the acquisitions of science in the stricter sense of the term. But objectors to a peculiar scientific nomenclature must remember that it is really useful,—nay, that without it *accuracy* in science, and therefore science itself, could not exist. Herschel defines science to be ‘the knowledge of many, orderly and methodically digested and arranged, so as to become attainable by one;’ and a convenient and, above all things, accurate nomenclature is a most essential part of what may be called the machinery of science. It thus appears that, to all except those who are content with a mere smattering of their subject, this bugbear of a special terminology is directly useful; and in no branch of science is it possible to dispense with its aid. A familiar illustration or two may make this more evident.

Popular phraseology is sometimes far too *comprehensive* and vague for scientific purposes, and it is necessary to introduce terms which have a restricted and definite meaning. How many scores of species of ‘creeping things’ are popularly called ‘black beetles,’ or ‘black clocks,’—or would be so called if they happened to come in the popular way! We must, however, have popular names for popular animals; and sometimes these ‘household words’ are quite accurate enough for ordinary scientific purposes. The little busy flea is so uni-

versally and well known as such, that to call it by any other name would be quite a superfluous business; though, judging from the ingenious euphemisms and the still more eloquent reticence of society in reference to a less active hanger-on, of somewhat larger growth, a good rattling Latin name would occasionally be most serviceable.

But parasites have a claim on our attention peculiar to themselves; and it rarely happens, with reference to the insect world, that any word in common use denotes, so precisely as those to which we have referred, the object intended. The terms *fly*, *butterfly*, *moth*, and *beetle*, go far to exhaust the species of entomologists. Something is done by qualifying such terms; e. g., *crane-fly*, *death's-head-moth*, *diamond-beetle*. Then somebody steps in and confounds the crane-fly with a fly something like it, and teaches men so. There is no limit to perversions of this kind. We once knew a man who persisted in calling sea-anemones 'gelatinous fishes.' Another was equally obstinate in calling them 'insects.' But the palm of superiority must be given to *The Times* newspaper, which, a few weeks ago, described the bottom of one of our iron frigates as covered with 'coralline vermicular shell-fish!' Talk of a nondescript which is neither fish, flesh, nor fowl,—what is that to a nondescript which is all three at once? The tendency in the popular use of words is universally to a vague and careless application of them; and not only so in the case of common words having scientific synonyms, but of all words; so that if a man will use words in their strict senses, he may live in the assurance of being abundantly misunderstood.

The corruptibility of common words, though in part a result of their ignorant and culpably careless misuse, is not wholly so. Much of the tendency to looseness in terms is the inevitable tendency of language to change; and this, it would appear, is a direct result of the constitution of our minds, and of certain laws of thought. A very able and interesting analysis of the conditions of this change, with highly instructive illustrations, may be found in Mr. John Stuart Mill's *System of Logic* (chapters iv. and v. of book iv.). The following short quotation embodies two principal results of this analysis. After tracing the 'natural history' of the words *gentleman*, *loyalty*, *pagan*, and *villain*, Mr. Mill writes:—

'These and similar instances, in which the original signification of a term is totally lost,—another and an entirely distinct meaning being first engrafted upon the former, and finally substituted for it,—afford examples of the double movement which is always taking place in language: two counter-movements, one of Generalization, by

which words are perpetually losing portions of their connotation, and becoming of less meaning and more general acceptation; the other of Specialisation, by which other, or even the same words, are continually taking on fresh connotation; acquiring additional meaning, by being restricted in their employment to a part only of the occasions on which they might properly be used before.'—Vol. ii., p. 236.

The language of science is not exempt from this liability to change; but it differs from common language in these important particulars: that changes are less frequent; and that, when introduced, they are introduced consciously and carefully—with due protection, therefore, against ambiguity on the one hand, and against a defective vocabulary on the other. Terminology is thus a sort of harbour of refuge for ideas that have no sure anchorage in the shifting sands of 'table-talk.'

That the introduction of Latin names, and of words derived from the Latin and Greek, tends to prevent that ambiguity which the common use of words so often produces, will be obvious from these three considerations. First, they are only likely to be used by persons both accurately acquainted with their meaning, and aware of the importance of their exact application. Secondly, such persons will only use such words in intercourse with such other persons; so that these words will have, at any rate, an additional chance of escaping corruption. Thirdly, the very fact of using such words is, in itself, a challenge to accuracy. And as the necessity for scientific terms, and facility in their use, grow precisely with the extent of a man's scientific knowledge, a student who objects to them is in the awkward predicament of a person anxious to read, but with an unfortunate prejudice against the alphabet.

But if popular language is, on the one hand, too comprehensive for scientific purposes; it is, on the other, often much too *limited* in its meaning. The former defect is felt chiefly in the denoting of species; the latter, in the indication of genera, and the description of phenomena. It is often necessary to express compendiously, and in relation to other ideas, ideas which are themselves very complex. In order to do this, words are constructed and specially appropriated to express conceptions which the etymology only very partially indicates. The words *polarisation* and *achromatism* are examples of this method. In other cases, phrases are introduced for a like purpose; e.g., *spherical aberration*, *chromatic aberration*, *index of refraction*, *circular polarisation*.

An important branch of science is classification; and how insufficient for that is popular phraseology, an illustration or

two may show. Crabs and oysters,—what are they? What, indeed, if not shell-fish? That account of them is suggested naturally by their watery *habitat*, and too often, alas! by their ‘ancient and fish-like smell.’ But, though they thus come under the same popular denomination, the crab and the oyster are as far removed from each other as the wood-louse and the oyster; and the crab is removed from any and every kind of fish by a whole division of the animal kingdom,—a division comprising no less than six classes with sesquipedalian names, and absolutely no end of orders, genera, and species! So much for an attempt at classification—and a failure. But what of those numberless cases where there is not even an attempt, nor a vestige of encouragement to make one? What of the grouping of the cat, the lion, the lynx, the leopard, and the tiger, under the common genus *Felis*? of the badger and the bear under *Ursus*? or even of the rabbit and the hare under *Lepus*?

To call a spade a spade, then; to avoid the elaborations of the Circumlocution Office; to say precisely what is meant; and to say it in the fewest words possible; this, little as the popular mind may think it, is a principal function of scientific nomenclature. There can be no compromise in the matter. It is not ‘a necessary evil,’ this scientific terminology for which we are pleading,—not a thing to be simply tolerated,—not merely a doubtful good;—but an absolute advantage, a necessity, a *sine quâ non* of science itself.

We have spoken principally of what would be called ‘hard words.’ There is, however, a class of words specially claimed by individual sciences, but not *in toto*;—words which branch, as it were, in several distinct directions for different sciences, sometimes also for the arts, and for the purposes of general intercourse. These are the real stumbling-blocks of science,—rocks the more dangerous because sunken rocks. If a word is really out of the ordinary course, it challenges attention. An explanation is sought, and probably found. If not, the meaning of the word will often (in the absence of any preconceived notion) be gathered from its use. But if not this, at least no false meaning is confidently assumed as the true one; and so, though light is lost, no positive error is made. But many words in daily use in the ordinary intercourse of life receive special applications in different sciences, the meaning of which the casual reader does not stop to inquire. Familiarity with the word breeds contempt of the difficulty. We may mention a few of them: ‘Reduction,’ in its arithmetical, algebraic, chemical, logical, artistic, surgical, and legal senses; ‘synthesis’

and 'analysis,' in their chemical, logical, and mathematical senses (to which, in the case of 'synthesis,' its surgical meaning must be added); 'resolution,' in its musical, mechanical, mathematical, medical, and legal applications; 'major,' in its musical, logical, military, and legal senses; 'power,' in its several mechanical, as well as in its mathematical, legal, political, and optical uses. It will readily be seen that the list might be swelled indefinitely; and that great confusion and error may result from the careless use or misapprehension of such words as the above, each of which has one or several ordinary as well as technical meanings. And, as illustrating both the possible ambiguity of such words, and the tendency to such an ambiguity in the popular use of them, we may refer again to the optical use of the word *power*. Amongst scientific men, magnifying power is always expressed in *linear* measure. Popularity, however, demands something more astonishing than this; and, to meet this want, the inferior microscope-makers often describe the powers of their instruments in essentially 'superficial' terms. The very moderate and modest power of 200 linear measure, translated into this vulgar tongue, is '40,000 times;' the highest power yet attained, even in these days of $\frac{1}{8}$ ths and $\frac{1}{4}$ ths, being only some 4,000 linear measure. The introduction, however, of the very convenient term *diameters*, which is always used by scientific observers, and by the better class of opticians, and which indicates linear measure, does away with all ambiguity on this point.

One other instance may be noticed of the confusion and error which may result from the vague and indefinite use of language in connexion with scientific matters. The phrase *microscopical science* is in very frequent use; and, if its meaning be confined within proper limits, it is a convenient expression. There *is* such a thing as microscopical science; there is *no* such thing as *a* microscopical science. Microscopical science we take to be those departments of various sciences—Chemistry, Mineralogy, Geology, Botany, Zoology, Vegetable and Animal Physiology, &c.—which, from the smallness of the objects concerned, require the aid of the microscope for their successful pursuit. But the distinction of small and great is altogether too unimportant and artificial to form the basis, in any science, of a classification into divisions, orders, genera, or even species. Much more, therefore, is it inadequate to form a ground for that classification of knowledge and inquiry, which constitutes the circle of the sciences.

To this remark the case of Astronomy is a seeming excep-

tion. But here the element of *size* is not more conspicuous, nor is it more really a basis of classification, than that of *distance*. The fact, however, is, that Astronomy is a division of Mechanics. It is the application of mechanical laws to a particular class of *bodies*; just as Statics and Dynamics are the application of those laws to particular classes of *cases*. And, were Astronomy a more decidedly separate science than it is, such separation might be justified by other essential peculiarities of the case;—as the necessarily indirect modes of observation,—in particular, of estimating distance, position, size, mass, and force; and (partly as a result of this) the extensive employment of Mathematics as an instrument of research; and, lastly, the utter exclusion of experiment,—a circumstance common, perhaps, only to Astronomy, Geology, and Meteorology, among the physical sciences.

The unlimited variety, and still more the marvellous beauty, of the minute forms which it reveals, have made the microscope a highly popular instrument. This is a most desirable result; but it is in danger of being mistaken for something else. After all, the microscope is now, and probably for a long time will be, in the hands of a large proportion of those who use it, little more than a 'scientific toy.' It would be as absurd to call much of the microscopical observation of the present day 'microscopical science,' as to dignify by the name of 'telescopic science' the reading of a tea-garden sign-board five miles off. Microscopic science, indeed, in a certain metaphorical sense it may be called, *microscopic* science—and nothing more. And however pleasant it may be to think of the advanced scientific taste of the public in general, and of ourselves in particular, we must remember that 'philosophy in sport' is a very different thing from 'science in earnest.'

It will be worth our while, even at the risk of some repetition, to consider a little more closely what are the necessary functions of a scientific nomenclature; whether any principles, and what, may be found underlying the seemingly arbitrary and complicated language now in use; and under what circumstances and conditions changes may be advantageously introduced. In doing this, both the use and the necessity of a special vocabulary will become still more apparent.

The subject has been well-nigh exhausted (as to its principles) by Dr. Whewell, in the work named at the head of this article. The first book of Dr. Whewell's volume consists of aphorisms respecting those ideas which are involved in the material sciences; especially those of '*Space, Time* (including

Number), *Cause* (including Force and Matter), *Outness* of Objects, and *Media* of Perception of Secondary Qualities, *Polarity* (Contrariety), Chemical *Composition* and *Affinity*, *Substance*, *Likeness* and Natural *Affinity*, *Means* and *Ends* (whence the Notion of Organization), *Symmetry*, and the Ideas of *Vital Powers*.' The second and third books are occupied with an examination of the inductive and other processes which are employed in the construction of science. But neither with Dr. Whewell's inductive philosophy, nor with the more extended metaphysical philosophy of which that forms a part, have we here anything to do. Our present concern is solely with the fourth book, which treats of the Language of Science.

The substance of the book is thrown into twenty-nine Aphorisms, which express with great conciseness the principal rules to be observed in the formation of scientific terms. These aphorisms are expanded and illustrated with great felicity, and some important distinctions are introduced. It is, however, unfortunate that Dr. Whewell's division and arrangement of his matter are not more logical and methodical. After a cursory review of the Ancient and Modern Scientific Nomenclatures, under the first two Aphorisms, Dr. Whewell says, 'Our remaining Aphorisms respecting the Language of Science will be collected and illustrated indiscriminately, from the precepts and the examples of preceding philosophers.' There is certainly a distinction made between the appropriation of common words and the formation of new ones; but this arrangement does not prevent frequent repetitions both in the Aphorisms themselves, and in their comments and illustrations. Some instances of this we shall have occasion to notice.

In considering the actual wants which a scientific vocabulary must supply, the first thing naturally that strikes us is, that *objects require to be named*. And here we must make a necessary distinction. We have hitherto used the terms *Nomenclature* and *Terminology* popularly, as if they were synonymous. Etymologically, there is little or no difference between them; but *Nomenclature* has been technically appropriated (in the first instance by Dr. Whewell) to signify the names of the *objects* of Science,—the distinct, individual *things* with which Science is concerned; while *Terminology* comprises the whole remainder of scientific terms,—all that is necessary for accurately and completely *describing* those objects. *Arragonite*, *Cactus*, *Boa constrictor*, are instances of Nomenclature; *prismatic*, *cotyledon*, *ophidian*, are examples of Terminology.

We have already seen that the terms popularly applied to objects are applied too vaguely for most purposes of science. For these purposes it is imperative that names should be used which are '*caviare* to the general.' Another consideration, which has been barely hinted at, but which is of great and obvious importance, is that the common vocabulary is *numerically insufficient* for the requirements of science. Common things must have common names. But the range of common observation is limited; and there are, literally, hundreds of thousands of species requiring accurate registration, description, and classification, which *have* no common names. Exactly because these objects *are* uncommon, it is unimportant that they should receive names which either are, or are capable of becoming, in any sense intelligible to the mass of mankind—were that even possible. But any scheme of popular names at all commensurate with the necessities of the case, would be met by several fatal objections. Common names are selected on no fixed principles, but are given quite at random. Science, however, requires that the *best* names should be carefully chosen and adopted; otherwise, there will be several indifferent or bad systems of Nomenclature either used simultaneously, or one rapidly superseding another. This is sometimes the case (as, for example, in Mineralogy) where the systems are not bad; where, on the contrary, they have been framed with great labour and care by men fully competent to such a task. In these cases, however, the fault frequently lies, not so much in the Nomenclature itself, as in the system of classification on which it is based.

One of the principal functions of a Nomenclature is to constitute, by its very form, a record of a system; so that the name shall indicate inevitably the relations of the things which it denotes. This is extremely well put by Mr. De Quincey, in the course of some valuable observations on the Metaphysical Terminology of Kant, but which may be extended to Terminology generally. It is important to remark that the word *Terminology* is here used in its widest sense, as comprehending both Terminology proper and Nomenclature. De Quincey's remark is this:—that one important advantage of a systematic Terminology 'consists in the substitutions of names which express the relations and dependencies of the object (*termini organici*) for the conventional names which have arisen from accident, and do *not* express those relations (*termini bruti*). It is on this principle that the nomenclature of chemistry is constructed: substances that were before known by arbitrary and non-significant names are now known by systematic names; that

is, such as express their relations to other parts of the system. In this way a Terminology becomes, in a manner, organic; and, being itself a product of an advanced state of the science, is an important re-agent for facilitating further advances.*

As the history of Mineralogy shows that a good classification is essential to the permanence of a nomenclature, so the annals of other sciences show the impossibility of establishing a classification without a corresponding nomenclature. There is between the two a reciprocal necessity; each is essential to the utility and permanence of the other. The botanical system of Cæsalpinus, the Ichthyological system of Willoughby, and Schlotheim's work on Fossil Vegetables, all fell into comparative oblivion, because unaccompanied by suitable nomenclatures.

The most remarkable and successful nomenclatures that we at present possess are those of Chemistry and Botany. That of Chemistry is so important and interesting, and so enormously extensive, that a merely casual discussion of it would be most unsatisfactory. It is, moreover, so eminently *sui generis*, that it could throw but little light on the general subject. But the botanical nomenclature is interesting, not only on account of its completeness, but because it was the first systematic nomenclature that was founded, and because it embodies a principle which has since been adopted with the greatest success in other departments of science. Respecting the Flora of the ancients there is to this day the greatest uncertainty, owing to the defective nomenclature by which plants were spoken of. In this nomenclature great improvements have from time to time been made; but it remained for Linnæus to supply a method that was simple and efficient, and that reduced the comparative chaos to a compact and easily intelligible system.

'The known species of plants,' writes Dr. Whewell, 'were ten thousand in the time of Linnæus, and are now probably sixty thousand. It would be useless to endeavour to frame and employ separate names for each of these species. The division of the objects into a subordinated system of classification enables us to introduce a Nomenclature which does not require this enormous number of names. The artifice employed is, to name a specimen by means of two (or it might be more) steps of the successive division. Thus in Botany, each of the genera has its name, and the species are marked by the addition of some epithet to the name of the genus. In this manner about one thousand seven hundred Generic Names, with a moderate number of Specific Names, were found by Linnæus

* *Works*, vol. xiii., pp. 88, 89.

sufficient to designate with precision all the species of vegetables known in his time. And this *Binary Method* of Nomenclature has been found so convenient, that it has been universally adopted in every other department of the natural history of organized beings."—(Page 307.)

As examples of this method, we may cite *Cichorium endivia* (the garden endive), *Papaver somniferum* (the white poppy), *Felis catus* (the common cat), *Equus asinus* (the common ass). Mohs, in his Mineralogical System, adopts a similar plan, but uses *three* terms, to designate the order, genus, and species of the mineral. *Rhombohedral Calc Haloide*, and *Paratomous Hal Baryte*, are examples of this.

One or two advantages resulting from the use of Latin names still remain to be noticed. The first and most important is, that by this means a nomenclature is secured which is intelligible to the scientific men of all nations, which all alike are interested in preserving, and which incurs no risk of change. The second advantage to be derived from the use of Latin words, or of Latin *forms*, if (as is often the case) the names are derived from Greek roots, is scarcely inferior. It lies in the symmetry and consistency which is thus given to the system, and which would be almost unattainable in any other way. This symmetry, with other important advantages, is secured in some sciences by making the terminations of names expressive. This is a resource of very great value in nomenclature; and, probably, capable of a more extended application than it has yet received. The chemical nomenclature is a splendid example of its successful employment. It has been proposed to apply the principle to the nomenclature of Mineralogy, where it could hardly fail to be an improvement on the heterogeneous mass of names now current.

It is often supposed that all play of fancy and imagination is rigorously excluded from scientific speculation. This is much less true than is frequently thought, with respect to the speculations themselves. It must, however, be admitted that scientific men generally assume a judicial sobriety at the christenings of their discoveries. But Dr. Whewell gives some instances of extraordinary caprice in this direction; and many others might be adduced. Two worthies, scandalized at the supposed sanction of the pagan mythology involved in the astronomical nomenclature, proposed a *Cælum Christianum*. The planets were to be named after Adam, Moses, and the Patriarchs; the constellations were to commemorate sacred places and things; and the twelve signs of the Zodiac were to be represented by the twelve apostles; so that, if these

reformers had carried their point, we might have found Adam in James the son of Alpheus, and Moses in James the son of Zebedee. This would scarcely be considered an improvement on the beautiful system of mythological names now in use. Linnæus had a graceful fancy of calling the butterflies after the Greek heroes. Some of his devices were more eccentric. From the circumstance that the Bauhins were a pair of brothers, he gave the name *Bauhinia* to a plant having its leaves in pairs! To a climbing plant he gave the name *Banisteria*, in honour of Banister, a mountain traveller. Linnæus advocates the system of incorporating proper names with the names of plants, as the only honour which Botany has to confer upon her discoverers; and the method has been extended to other sciences. But surely discoverers might well forego this honour, for the sake of preventing such disfigurements of nomenclature as *Cinchona Humboldtiana*, *Rheum Webbianum*, *Podocytis Schomburgkii*, *Orbitoides Prattii*. As contrasts to these names may be mentioned *Dielytra spectabilis*, *Lavandula vera*, *Viola tricolor*, *Codium tomentosum*, *Mimosella gracilis*. Berzelius has given the name *Eschynite*, from *αἰσχυνή*, shame, to a certain mineral, because he considered it a shame to chemists that they did not at first more accurately analyse it. The names given by the old alchemists almost always appear fanciful to us; but this is not to be wondered at, considering the air of romance in which Alchemy itself was shrouded, and the utterly unscientific character of the pursuit. Even now caprice occasionally appears in chemical nomenclature, as in the term *ellagic acid*, which was suggested by spelling the word *Galle* backwards.

We come now to the consideration of Terminology—the *descriptive* language of science. It will be obvious on a very slight consideration, that, though Nomenclature may outstrip Terminology in the *number* of its terms, the *office* of the latter is much more extensive than that of the former. The mere cataloguing of its objects is but a small part of the business of Science. And, just as Science brings to our notice a vast number of *things* which escape common observation, and require a systematic *nomenclature*; so it discovers in these bodies a variety of *parts, properties, and relations* which it is the business of *Terminology* accurately to describe. We have, therefore, to consider what the special offices of Terminology are, the conditions under which those offices have to be performed, and the methods and rules which are found to afford a good Terminology.

We have already shown generally, that common language is as insufficient for the purposes of science in the department of Terminology, as in that of Nomenclature. One principal reason of this is, that the ordinary course of human thought does not involve scientific *ideas*. This is well illustrated by an anecdote which Dr. Whewell relates (pp. 47, 48) in connexion with accidental discoveries, and in particular with Bartholinus's 'accidental' discovery of the double refraction of light. 'A lady, in describing an optical experiment which had been shown her, said of her teacher, "He told me to *increase and diminish the angle of refraction*, and at last I found that he only meant me to move my head up and down."' Given the accident, or any number of accidents, that lady could never have discovered double refraction, so long as she supposed the cause of the phenomena to be, not in the properties of light, but in the position of her head. For the discovery of double refraction, a clear conception of *single refraction* was necessary.

In all cases, science investigates, with an accuracy far transcending common observation, the forms, qualities, properties, and relations of bodies. It examines organs and their functions in the organized world; and in the inorganic as well as in the organic creation, it scrutinizes processes and phenomena. In the *experimental sciences* we have a new and, as it were, artificial class of wants. We require terms to describe our apparatus, its parts, the functions of those parts, the operations we perform, and the results we obtain. *Voltameter*, *astatic needle*, *deflection*, *electrolysis*, *anion*, and *cathion*, are instances of such terms drawn from the science of Galvanism. Further, 'as it is principles, not phenomena,—laws, not insulated independent facts,—which are the objects of inquiry to the natural philosopher,'* he requires yet another development of his language to express, first, those general laws at which he arrives; and then those tentative hypotheses, and more firmly established theories, which he forms in his efforts to discover the ultimate constitution of things, and to arrive at a knowledge of *causes*. And the lower terminology is an essential condition of even the existence of the higher; just as the more elementary algebraic symbols are a necessary step to the higher mathematics. Indeed, the analogy between terminology in general and mathematical symbols, is by no means merely superficial. Both alike enable us to express compendiously very elaborate conceptions, and large classes of facts; and to deal with them as if they were single facts, and comparatively

* Herschel's *Preliminary Discourse*.

simple conceptions. This analogy culminates in the science of Crystallography; in which, from the complexity of the relations to be described, words utterly fail, and the only satisfactory mode of expression is by means of symbols themselves.

But so far is any extension of this extreme symbolic development from being desirable, that it would be placed in direct antagonism with a fundamental principle of scientific investigation; viz., that we should retain in our minds the liveliest possible conception of the facts and phenomena from which our laws are deduced; and of the exact relations of those laws to the facts on which they are built. 'It is as necessary,' says Mr. John Stuart Mill, 'on all subjects not mathematical, that the things on which we reason should be conceived by us in the concrete, and "clothed in circumstances," as it is in algebra that we should keep all individualizing peculiarities sedulously out of view.'* The general aphorism into which Mr. Mill throws the principles which should regulate the choice between a symbolical and an expressive terminology (or nomenclature) is, that 'whenever the nature of the subject permits our reasoning processes to be, without danger, carried on mechanically, the language should be constructed on as mechanical principles as possible; while, in the contrary case, it should be so constructed that there shall be the greatest possible obstacles to a merely mechanical use of it.'† In his explanation of this aphorism, Mr. Mill shows that the cases in which mechanical processes of reasoning can safely be adopted form, not (as some have supposed) a large, but only a small portion of the domain of science; that, while they do not include the whole even of mathematics, none lie fairly beyond the limits of that science.

Terminology, much more than Nomenclature, is capable of being made expressive by the very form of its terms; both because the *sort* of meaning to be conveyed is, in the former case, more suitable to that mode of expression than in the latter; and because, in the former case, the meaning of the individual terms is much more limited than in the latter. Of all the qualities which may be observed in iodine, mica, equisetum, nautilus, only one or two can be embodied in the form of the name. But such terms as *volatile*, *lamina*, *cuticle*, and *septum*, really express the whole, or almost the whole, of their meaning. It is always desirable, and often necessary, most rigorously to define these terms; e. g., to show the difference between *cuticle* and *epidermis*. But the definitions themselves will often be unintelligible to unscientific readers;

* *System of Logic*, vol. ii., p. 261.

† *Ibid.*, vol. ii., p. 256.

and the exact meaning of the terms will be learned only from their employment by the most careful writers. 'The history of science is our Dictionary; the steps of scientific induction are our Definitions.'

The most comprehensive terminology, (belonging to any one science,) as well as in some other respects the most remarkable, is that of Botany. It has arrived at such perfection that plants might, indeed, be drawn with almost perfect accuracy from their botanical descriptions. A partial exception must be made in respect of colour, no exact mode of describing this being at all generally agreed upon. Even here, however, a definite scale has been made possible by an ingenious contrivance of M. Merimée, based on the fact that any shade of colour may be produced by the mixture of the pure colours (red, yellow, and blue) with grey. But apart from this, it is a truly wonderful result, considering the extreme variety and complexity of form and position in the organs of plants, that such exact description should be possible. As an illustration of the extent to which this exactitude is carried, we may enumerate some of the terms applied to a particular class of *forms* of leaf, all referring to modified resemblances of leaves to a feather; and in no way concerned with the disposition of the leaves on the stem, for which a separate set of terms is used:—*pinnate*, *bipinnate*, *tripinnate*, *abruptly pinnate*, *alternately pinnate*, *articulate pinnate*, *decursively pinnate*, *interruptedly pinnate*, *oppositely pinnate*, *pinnate cirrose*, *pinnatifid*, *bipinnatifid*, *pinnatilobate*, *pinnatipartite*, *pinnatisect*. Without a copious terminology, species could not be described; and, in fact, a permanent nomenclature would not be possible.

Accuracy, however, is not the sole requisite of scientific language. The cultivation of science does not quite extinguish the cultivation of æsthetics; and, admitting some flagrant breaches of good taste, scientific men generally show a tolerable regard for euphony in constructing their terms. Indeed, in estimating this fact we must consider the depths of *ugliness* into which it is possible to plunge! Further, no scientific man (unless a pedant,—and if a pedant, he is, so far, an *unscientific* man) values a word for its length.

In addition to euphony and brevity, an important requisite is the capability of being modified by inflexion and composition. Our own language is but slightly endowed with this quality; hence (as one reason) such frequent resort to the classical languages. This point is appositely illustrated by Dr. Whewell.

'If we were content with the term *Heat*, to express the science

of heat, (for which purpose it is, on other grounds, unsuitable,) still it would be a bad technical term, for we cannot derive from it an adjective, like *thermotical*. If *bed* or *layer* were an equally good term with *stratum*, we must still retain the latter, in order that we may use the derivative *stratification*, for which the English words cannot produce an equivalent substitute. We may retain the words *lime* and *flint*; but their adjectives for scientific purposes are not *limy* and *flinty*, but *calcareous* and *siliceous*; and hence we are able to form a compound, as *calcareo-siliceous*, which we could not do with indigenous words. We might fix the phrases *bent back* and *broken* to mean (of optical rays) that they are *reflected* and *refracted*; but then we should have no means of speaking of the angles of *Reflection*, and *Refraction*, of the *Refractive Indices*, and the like.' —Pp. 318, 319.

It would be easy to multiply illustrations. In the derivatives of the word *pinnate* recently given, we have a number of terms, all necessary, all definite, and all expressing some sort of resemblance to a feather. This resemblance, with its modifications, is indicated in the structure of the terms; and thus the recollection both of the terms and of the conceptions they represent is greatly facilitated. Again, if we look to the science of Electricity, we shall find the same want advantageously met in the same way. We have the division of the science into *Electro-statics*, and *Electro-dynamics*; the cognate sciences or divisions of *Electro-Magnetism*, *Magneto-Electricity*, *Thermo-Electricity*, and, according to some philosophers, '*Electro-Biology*.' We have *electrics* and *dielectrics*; *electrolysis*, *electrolytes*, and *electrolytic*. Of the modern chemical nomenclature this capability of modification is the *conditio sine quâ non*.

A remaining condition, partly, indeed, anticipated by the foregoing remarks, is, that 'terms must be constructed and appropriated so as to be fitted to enunciate simply and clearly true general propositions.' This is the fundamental and sole essential requisite both of terminology and of nomenclature. Euphony, brevity, symmetry, and philological analogy are all desirable, and even important; but only so far as they are included in this maxim are they essential; and so far they are essential. And not only must terms be fitted to express *absolute truth*, but also for embodying theoretical views, which may or may not be true, but which have, in any case, at least a temporary use. The rival theories of electricity propounded by Du Fay and Franklin, for example, cannot *both* be true; nor, probably, is either of them. But, pending the decision of that question, we must have terms for the discussion of the theories; as well as for the expression of facts, the independent consideration of

which may lead to some truer theory. And it is no sufficient objection either to the theories or the terms, that they are imperfect.

Several aphorisms relating to the *formation* of technical terms remain unnoticed. The first is this: 'In the Ancient Period of Sciences, Technical Terms were formed in three different ways:—by appropriating common words and fixing their meaning;—by constructing terms containing a description;—by constructing terms containing reference to a theory.' From the illustrations of this aphorism, it appears that the appropriation of common words for scientific purposes, generally, at least, implies modification of their meaning. The first aphorism, therefore, would seem to include the fifth, which is:—'When common words are appropriated as technical terms, their meaning may be modified, and must be rigorously fixed.' And of this the sixth aphorism seems to be a mere verbal variation: 'When common words are appropriated as technical terms, this must be done so that they are not ambiguous in their application.'

'The appropriation of old words is preferable to the invention of new ones;' and 'their meaning and relations in common use should be retained as far as can conveniently be done.' When this condition cannot be fulfilled, or when ambiguity is inevitable in the use of common words, the seventh aphorism directs us to form new words, rather than employ old ones as technical terms.

The scientific appropriation of common words requires to be made with extreme caution. The ideas to be conveyed are in any case so far modifications of the ordinary significations of the terms, that great confusion in their use and apprehension is almost inevitable. In the science of Electricity, for example, what difficulty does the student experience in forming a correct and exact notion of the technical meaning of the terms 'quantity' and 'intensity,' introduced by Dr. Wollaston! It conveys a very good idea of 'intensity' to adduce as an illustration a flash of lightning. But it seems a paradox to say that the most powerful flash contains scarcely a sufficient 'quantity' of electricity to gild a single pin, or decompose a drop of water; and that, in respect of 'quantity,' it is inferior to the current furnished by the immersion of a zinc wire and a silver one in diluted acid. 'Quantity,' in the voltaic arrangement, depends on the size of the plates; 'intensity' on the number of alternations. Among other comparisons of effects, 'quantity' determines the diameter of a platinum wire which a current will heat; 'intensity,' its length. There is a sufficient reason for

the adoption of these terms ; but it does not lie on the surface of the phenomena ; on the contrary, it is suggested only by somewhat recondite experiments and considerations. The terms are good, not because of, but in spite of, their familiar use in other connexions.

The second and ninth aphorisms relate to the *systematic* element in nomenclature and terminology ; and the second, with its comments and illustrations, appears to include the substance of the ninth. The eleventh aphorism again seems to be involved in the first and second ; all three referring, in much the same way, to theoretical terms.

In the construction of new terms, regard must be had to etymological proprieties. Hybrids must, as a rule, be excluded. But such convenient words as *mineralogy* and *terminology* (which could not well be replaced) will show that occasional exceptions must be made ; and to be too nice on this point is to mistake the means for the end. There is a tendency, strong and almost universal, to introduce changes in nomenclature and terminology, not exactly for the sake of doing so, but still on comparatively trivial grounds. Besides the inconvenience attaching to a new term *as* new, there is this objection to superfluous technical terms, that, as in science it is assumed that distinctions are not made where differences do not exist, the attention of the student is distracted, and his mind perplexed to discover the exact meaning of the new term. The attendant evils are so great that only decided advantages can warrant the introduction of new terms ; and those who have been the greatest benefactors to science in this very matter of nomenclature, as Linnæus and Cuvier, have been above all others careful to avoid needless innovations. Rash changes in nomenclature are no less fatal to the systems they introduce than is the total absence of nomenclature. When a change becomes really necessary, 'the new term should contain in its form some memorial of the old one.'

There are a few aphorisms in the *Novum Organon Renovatum*, which have been suggested by the recent progress of science. These were not contained in the earlier editions of the *Philosophy of the Inductive Sciences*, of which the present work is a partial republication. In so far as they are not involved in the previous aphorisms, they will be interesting chiefly to the scientific reader ; which must be our apology for not noticing them in detail.

In conclusion, we cannot better sum up the question, as between the advantages of common and of technical terms for scientific use, than in Dr. Whewell's words :—

'Indigenous terms may be employed in the descriptions of facts and phenomena as they at first present themselves; and in the first induction from these; but when we come to generalize and theorize, terms borrowed from the learned languages are more readily fixed and made definite, and are also more easily connected with derivatives. Our native terms are more impressive, and at first more intelligible; but they may wander from their scientific meaning, and are capable of little inflexion. Words of classical origin are precise to the careful student, and capable of expressing, by their inflexions, the relations of general ideas; but they are unintelligible, even to the learned man, without express definition, and convey instruction only through an artificial and rare habit of thought.'—Page 328.

ART. VII.—1. *Narrative of the late War in New Zealand.* By LIEUT. COL. CAREY, C.B., Deputy Adjutant General. London: Bentley. 1863.

2. *'One of England's little Wars: ' a Letter to the Duke of Newcastle, &c.,* By OCTAVIUS HADFIELD, Archdeacon of Kapete.

A Sequel to 'One of England's Little Wars.' London: Williams and Norgate. 1860, 1861.

The Second Year of 'One of England's Little Wars.' 1862.

3. *New Zealand as it was and as it is.* By R. B. PAUL, M.A., late Archdeacon of Nelson. London: Stanford. 1861.

4. *The Waitara Dispute.* By PROFESSOR HAROLD BROWNE. 1861.

5. *The Taranaki Question.* By SIR W. MARTIN, D.C.L., late Chief Justice of New Zealand. London: 1861.

6. *Papers relative to the recent Disturbances in New Zealand.* Presented to both Houses of Parliament in March, 1861, by command of Her Majesty.

7. *Further Papers relative to Do.* Presented, &c., in July, 1862.

WHEN we last wrote at any length about New Zealand, we could express ourselves in these terms: * 'If conferences between the natives and the Government authorities become frequent, we may hope that the natives may soon be trained to take part in the general legislature of the island, and that the chiefs may soon occupy some position in connexion with the government in all matters affecting the interests of their tribes.' Then we hoped better relations might be established

* See the *London Quarterly Review* for January, 1861, p. 552.

between the races. We still have the same hope, and look to the same means for realising it. But the harmony, which, we trust, will soon be finally established between the colonists and that interesting and noble race on which so much missionary effort has been expended, and, it seemed, with such signal success, was destined to have as its prelude a longer time of discord than we looked for three years ago. Since then the war of which we then explained the origin has been brought to a close: at any rate hostilities ceased; there have been two years of false peace; and now (since May last) we have been engaged in a new Maori war, which some tell us will end only with the virtual extinction of the native race. Our readers will not forget that the ostensible cause of the late troubles was a plot of ground called the Waitara block, lying along the sea-board of the province of Taranaki, (due west of Hawkes' Bay,) between the Waitara river and Cape Egmont. It was purchased long ago, together with more land in Taranaki, by the New Zealand Company, of its real owners, then in exile near Wellington; Governor Fitzroy, acting in the interest of the natives, annulled the sale; and soon after the natives began their *land-leagues*. Then, as we know, Te Teira asserted his ownership; government, after over eight months' *investigation*, purchased; and then—*at the time*, says one party,—*some time after*, says the other—Wiremu Kingi (Te Teira's suzerain) asserted the *tribal right*, and denied the power of any single clansman to sell what was a joint possession. This brought on the war which lasted from March, 1860, to March, 1861; and either created or was an excuse for that general disaffection among the powerful tribes who had taken up the 'Maori King' movement, which led to the present more wide-spread outbreak.

Our plan will be, first, to give a very brief sketch of the campaign of 1860–61, taking as our text-book the only military work which has appeared on the subject. Then to specify Colonel Gore Browne's terms of peace, and to show that *they were never acceded to*. Next will come Sir G. Grey's conscientious, but as many think unwise, act, the giving up of the very block which had been the occasion of the whole quarrel. Then the native quibble about our still holding the land, and their consequent refusal to evacuate parts of the neighbouring New Plymouth district, which they had occupied during the war. After this we must glance at the intermediate troubles, the period of restless upheaving on the one side and constant anxiety on the other, which preceded the second war. Then the scene shifts; we are no longer fighting by the Waitara

river for a poor six hundred acres; we are on the Waikato, (the great stream which, coming out of the central lake Taupo, runs north and, receiving the Waipu, turns west and divides the Waikato tribe-land from the ceded land of Auckland). The war has moved up north; our chief foes are still the Waikato, the sovereign tribe, to whom Wiremu Kingi gave up his rights over the Waitara block, the tribe to whom belongs the native king. In the last war they came down to fight us on our own ground; now we are returning the compliment by forcing our way into theirs.

They are not alone, other tribes are helping, more are sympathising; and it is thought that the recent proclamation *confiscating the lands of the tribes who are at war with us* will have an injurious effect, by forcing all the natives to make common cause. But we are anticipating events. We have first of all to go briefly over the chief points of the last war. Lieutenant Colonel Carey well remarks that

‘while the natives were willing at first to see the white man in their country, and to accept the benefits and luxuries he introduced, they had neither contemplated his so soon overpowering them and becoming the dominant race, nor had they calculated on seeing their lands and old regal sway pass into his hands. Their fears were further excited by the boasting of settlers, who told them that, whether they liked or not, they must sell their lands to them.’

So long ago as August, 1859, the governor was aware that the natives *were being urged to arms by disaffected Europeans*; but this bad advice had less influence than the cry for ‘land’ which was raised whenever a peculiarly rich tract, cultivated or uncultivated, was found, and that by men who had already more land than they did or could cultivate.

This is Colonel Carey’s view. He adds:—

‘The purchase of the Waitara block, the cause of all these troubles, was forced on the governor by partial statements and political pressure. He was told he could enforce the sale by a show of determination There can be no greater proof that the quarrel was of our seeking, and that we might have postponed the issue to a more convenient season, than the tardiness with which the more powerful and influential tribes implicated themselves in large numbers in it, and the extreme caution with which they avoided being the first to shed blood.’

We had then only about one thousand soldiers in the island, of whom just one hundred and ninety-two were near the disputed land; but the natives took no advantage of this, being slow in their movements, and, Colonel Carey says, childish in

their tactics. Indeed, the war was conducted on what the Maori consider chivalrous principles. Wiremu Kingi, by placing the disputed land in the hands of the Maori king, obliged him and his chief partisans, the powerful Waikatos, either to espouse his quarrel against Te Teira and the English, or to confess the impotence of the king movement. But the Waikatos went to war with the tacit understanding that we *should fight it out in the disputed district*. Every one must have remarked how strictly *local* the late war was; and this was a great advantage to us at a time when our troops were so few, for it enabled Major General Pratt to keep his men together, instead of breaking them up for the defence of widely scattered settlements, while the Waikatos, massed together and far from their own lands, suffered severely. As to *who began it* Colonel Carey is very clear. On March 18th, 1860, we took the pah erected by Wiremu Kingi, on what he claimed as his land; * ten days after the natives retaliated by killing some settlers at Omata, *whom they had warned that (as war had begun, and blood had been shed on both sides) it was unsafe to wander about the district*. 'The local papers carefully kept in the background the fact that their deaths took place *after* the 18th, and tried to make it appear that the Maoris had begun the war by murdering inoffensive colonists.'

On the 27th of June, an attack by Major Nelson on one of Wiremu Kingi's pahas was defeated with the loss of thirty left on the field, and thirty-two wounded; a large proportion out of three hundred and thirty-one engaged. Our men had no chance amid swamps, gullies, and dense fern; while the native loss was so trifling, that after the battle they exclaimed, 'How is it we all escaped?' This defeat made many waverers think of declaring against us; and, as General Gold, by plundering and burning native 'whairees,' had taught the Maoris the approved mode of conducting a campaign, they were not slow to imitate our example.

As we have again and again said, the country presented insuperable difficulties to active operations. Colonel Carey devotes nine pages to an account of the Warea 'forest pah,' erected by the Taranaki tribe after their defeat at the Waireka valley. Troops, however, had come in from Melbourne; General Pratt had landed; and there was a hope the natives might be over-awed. They were still not unfriendly to Europeans: officers of the Native Department rode about through the country, visiting Maori chiefs and gleaning all the informa-

* This is the battle of Waireka so often referred to.

tion they could, and were never molested. The missionaries, too, remained at their posts. But the colonists were angry and determined not to help the Government in any way. Colonel Carey animadverts strongly on their selfishness, *c. y.*, their refusing to bring their cattle into New Plymouth for sale, though the contractors offered double the usual price, preferring to have them carried off by the natives, so as to be able to claim compensation by and by. He says the civil authorities would not allow any sanitary regulations in the town, which was now crowded with refugees of all ages. Hence fever and diphtheria, fortunately kept down by the heavy rains, which partly washed away the accumulations of filth.

Towards the middle of September, about 1,700 natives being now in arms, we march 1,000 men to the north of New Plymouth, and destroy three pāhs with the loss of one man on our side, and twelve on that of the enemy: the pāhs had been abandoned on our approach, there being (to Colonel Carey's astonishment) no attempt at an ambush to take us as we marched in.

On the 12th of October, Major Hutchins destroys three strong pāhs on the Tataraimaka block, a piece of English ground to the south of New Plymouth. There was more fighting here; one officer and four men fell; and a perfect storm of indignation was raised in the House of Assembly, because the defenders had been suffered to escape. How, asks Colonel Carey, could it be avoided in such ground as that on which the pāhs were built?

But now the Waikato tribes join Wiremu Kingi, 'not as his allies, but as his masters; indeed, what between English bullets and the abuse and extortion of the Waikatos, the Taranakis must have henceforth had a poor time of it.' The Waikatos are the flower of the Maori nation, looking on all the rest as little better than slaves; they are great boasters, and began by the threat of driving the *pakeha* into the sea. However, a joint attack by General Pratt and Colonel Gold on the old pāh Makoetaki, which they had occupied in the open, was most successful. Shelled out of their cover, they were driven off, leaving forty-nine dead (among them several chiefs) in our hands, and losing on the whole at least thrice that number, while our loss was only four killed. Thus was the prestige of the Waikatos broken. More pāhs were presently taken, despite the rifle pits with which the hill sides were filled. Our plan then was not to storm the pāhs, in doing which, it was thought (though General Cameron has since proved the contrary) we should have sacrificed many men, and therefore (according to native ideas) have lost the victory; but to throw up a

redoubt and shell them from it. It is noteworthy that these Waikatos would not fight on Sunday; they ran up a white flag, while our men went on with their building. At length, on the 21st of January, 1861, the Waikatos roused themselves to fury by dancing their war dances, and at daybreak of the 23rd they made a desperate attack on our redoubts, charging up hill, rushing up the parapets, seizing our men's bayonets in their naked hands. Of course it is all in vain; they are charged right and left by troops, a gun is brought to play on them, and they are driven off with great loss. Meanwhile our chain of redoubts is gradually driving the enemy further and further into the forest; mortars and Armstrong guns are sent up; and at last the Waikatos, seeing the struggle hopeless, go home, leaving some chiefs to conclude negotiations. On April 3rd, General Pratt sails back to Australia, and General Cameron takes the command in New Zealand.

'General Pratt's campaign was one continued success, contrasting very strikingly with the wars against Heki and others: if there is any future disturbance, it will be the fault of the colonists, who almost seem desirous of fomenting the quarrel in order to profit by the great military expenditure. Their conduct to the natives is bad; even friendly tribes are treated with the greatest brutality; many were hindered from returning to their allegiance by fear of this ill-treatment; and prisoners had to be carefully guarded from the unmanly attacks of settlers. The soldiers, on the contrary, buried the native dead, fenced in their graves, &c., &c.'

This is a summary of Colonel Carey's closing remarks: he writes, we cannot but think, with unfair prejudice against the colonists. As to what he says of the colonial newspapers, it is the normal state of a military man to be at war with the local press.

Governor Browne's terms of peace were, the abandonment of the Waitara block by both parties until the title was made out, compensation for property destroyed, and for murders committed, and absolute and unreserved submission to the Queen's sovereignty, and the authority of the law. By this last point, he doubtless meant to insist on the pulling down of the Maori flag; but the terms were never fulfilled, and (owing we suppose to Colonel Browne's recall) no attempt was made to enforce them. Strange! that during the whole period between the two wars there was scarcely an effort to introduce the *Queen's peace* into native districts.

Every point connected with the question is fiercely disputed. Sir G. Grey has his advocates,* who say, 'A former course of

* Letter in the *Guardian* Newspaper, November 25th, 1863.

policy had made the natives so distrustful of our government that even Sir G. Grey could not convince them that it had their true welfare at heart.' On the other hand, Governor Browne does not want energetic defenders; the Rev. Harold Browne of Cambridge has heard from old residents that his brother's policy persevered in for six months longer would have given permanent peace. Sir C. Clifford, late Speaker of the House of Representatives, is very indignant that the late Governor should be charged with 'having forcibly deprived the natives of their lands.' He says that, on the contrary, 'Teira's title to the Waitara block was *perfectly good*, and could be proved in any court of law,' and that the minister of native affairs stated this to Sir G. Grey. The more recent troubles he attributes to Sir G. Grey's *giving up the Waitara block just when he did*. The concession impressed the natives with a false idea of their superiority; and he goes on to speak in very high terms of Colonel Browne's firmness in upholding the honour of his country and extreme solicitude to do more than justice to the native race.

It seems that for many years the land question has been in a very unsatisfactory state; land quarrels *amongst the natives* have been frequent and severe, leading to their murdering one another on the high road, almost close to British garrisons. Governor Browne's proclamation, meant to put an end to the feud, was, 'that while he would buy no land with *rightfully* disputed title, he would not permit any one to hinder the sale of land by natives who wished and had a right to sell.' Of course all hinges on *the right to sell*; and hence the need of a legal officer above any possible suspicion of favouring the colonists; the 'officials experienced in such transactions,' who have hitherto been the advisers of the governors, being by the Maori characterized as 'the very men who had bought land unfairly before, and wished to do the same again.'

We remarked years ago on the exceeding difficulty of forming a decision as to the merits of the whole case, owing to the very conflicting testimony given by witnesses apparently of equal credit. We have seen that Colonel Carey is thoroughly on the native side as to the Waitara business. The clergy of the Establishment have very generally taken the same side; it seems to have been a point of honour with many of them to forget the motto, *Audi alteram partem*.

There are exceptions, however. Archdeacon Paul, late of Nelson, thinks the natives have been remarkably well treated, and have not always been duly grateful. He says, 'In every case, the native possessor is as free to sell or to retain his free-

hold, as any landed proprietor in England.' When the law is broken, (he tells us,) it is the colonist who suffers. If his cattle stray, he has to redeem them by an exorbitant payment: if he pounds native cattle for trespass, an armed party break down the fence and rescue them. Herds of pigs get into his crops: dogs of the pah worry his sheep. *Redress in courts of law is not to be had, because it would be dangerous to the peace of the country to enforce the judgment.* Yet, in spite of all these provocations, in proof of which he refers to Mr. Richmond's memorandum, the colonists have uniformly restrained themselves, and been content with praying the governor that the majesty of the law may be vindicated, and the Queen's authority upheld. Mr. Paul speaks strongly of 'the signal chastisement which will sooner or later be inflicted on the stirrers up of this unrighteous war.' He is very decided about the Waitara block: 'Kingi has not the smallest real claim to it; the previous investigation had lasted eight months, Teira's title was pronounced by Mr. McLean, chief land-purchase commissioner, to be unexceptionable; and Kingi's case was that of a man, admitted on sufferance into a neighbour's house, forbidding the owner to dispose of it.'

In direct opposition to this is the opinion of Archdeacon Hadfield. The opening sentence of his first 'Letter' is enough to show the *animus* of his numerous pamphlets. He says, 'When a flagrant act of injustice has been committed by the governor of a British colony in the name of Her Majesty, it is not easy to determine what course to pursue.'

According to him, the question at issue is simply this:—'Is a native chief to be forcibly ejected from his land because a single clansman tells a subordinate land-agent that it is his and not the chief's, and that agent believes him?' Mr. Hadfield speaks of Governor Browne as being made a tool of by a low-bred man who wished to gratify feelings of revenge against his suzerain. He further asserts positively that in March, 1859, when Teira first proposed to sell, Wiremu Kingi made a most emphatic protest, quoting the governor's own edict, 'that he would never buy land without an undisputed title.' '*Teira's father did really own a small piece of the block; but he co-operated with Wiremu Kingi in opposing its alienation.*'

Much more which the archdeacon advances is so diametrically opposed to the governor's statements that we are glad to see he is able to open a way for mutual explanation.—'Kingi was misunderstood by Mr. Parris; he said, when asked, "Is it Teira's land?"—"Yes," *yes* meaning, in Maori idiom,

"you are right to a certain extent, but," &c.' It is a pity, truly, that we should be involved in two wars with a people whom we have no desire to fight, because *yes* is not to be understood in a straightforward manner.

Anyhow, Mr. Hadfield is right in claiming for the natives (as we have before insisted) *an impartial court where their claims can be stated, and evidence received on oath*. At present no principles have been laid down as to what constitutes a title; the commissioners are often ill-qualified by education and habits of thought to deal with such difficult questions; besides, *it is their business to buy land*. So far we can thoroughly go with the Maori archdeacon; but we cannot follow him in his violent attacks on Governor Browne. The amount of bitterness which this unhappy struggle has set free is quite astonishing; and no one, on either side, is more bitter than the Rev. Octavius Hadfield.

One remarkable sentence we must quote: 'I never, before the war broke out, was so thoroughly convinced of the deep hold the Christian religion had taken of those under my charge, as I have been since.' We would fain hope that events may justify this opinion.

Sir W. Martin's pamphlet (of nearly 150 pages) is a lawyer's view of the points in dispute. He discusses, at considerable length, the native tenure of land; and ends by expressing his regret that the offices of native secretary and chief land-purchase commissioner were *combined in the same person*, the natives being thus deprived of the help which they ought to have had from the native department: '*in many parts the natives scarcely knew the government, except as a purchaser of land*.' As to the *king movement*, Sir William looks at it as a feeling out after law and order, *the law and order which we ought to have given them*; he quotes from the Report of Committee to the House of Representatives, October, 1860, to show that it was *not a treasonable movement*: 'they do not understand the term "king" in the sense in which we use it.'

But we have had enough of conflicting pamphlets: it is not for us *tantas componere lites*. We are quite sure there were grave faults on both sides: the Maori, often partially successful in former wars, had an overweening idea of their own superiority; the settlers, thinking a war of races must come sooner or later, appear to have kept the wound open rather than to have done anything to conciliate after the cessation of hostilities in March, 1861.

The course of events in the former war, and the dispute which led to it, are now before the reader; *which party was in*

the right we leave to be gathered from the documentary evidence of which we have given a summary. The statements are so conflicting that we cannot pretend to form a decided opinion.

It remains to note the cause of the new outbreak, and the present position of parties. The 'peace' in March, 1861, was clearly but a hollow one. Yet things went on for months very quietly. The relevant news from the island during the interval between the cessation of hostilities in March, 1861, and the massacre of the escort, May 4th, 1863, is exceedingly scanty. We have before us a file of the *Army and Navy Gazette* for 1862, and do not find in it one particle of intelligence. The latest dispatches from Governor Browne bear date, September 30th, 1861; they reached Downing Street on December 20th. They contain a letter of thanks from the poor half-ruined settlers in Taranaki; some hints as to the disaffection of various tribes and the 'sulky feeling' among others; (*e. g.*, 'the Ngatiruanis, south of New Plymouth, will not suffer any European to visit or pass through their country;') and also a clear statement of *THE DIFFICULTY*, which unhappily is even more of a difficulty now than it was then—of devising any method to civilise, protect, guide, and yet restrain, the natives, *in a way which shall be acceptable to them, and not distasteful to the rapidly increasing European population*. From time to time, tidings come of gold discoveries: the Lancashire distress increases the stream of emigration. Over a thousand left Birkenhead, in May last, from Oldham and its neighbourhood for New Zealand. Still everybody feels that things are not comfortable. We read, early in January, that Major General Cooper has been appointed to the chief command at the Auckland Head Quarters, thus leaving Lieutenant General Cameron free to watch what is going on in the interior. Sir George Grey does what he can, by his immense personal influence, to keep the main body of natives faithful, and to prevent the local conflict, which he saw was inevitable, from growing into a long and general war. He goes amongst the Waikatos, and thinks he succeeds in persuading them to leave the Taranaki natives to themselves. These latter had occupied the block lying south-west of New Plymouth, (separated from it by a narrow strip of native land,) called Tataraimaka, which had been deserted by its owners during the war. But, worse than this, the intermediate strip was held by natives so unfriendly as to allow no European to pass across their land; so that the only road was a winding one along the shore. Sir George Grey goes to New Plymouth: he takes forcible possession of the Tataraimaka block, and builds a

stockade, alleging to the natives that it is European property, and must not be 'held in pledge' (as the Maori said they were doing) for the *Waitara* block, which was still being 'adjudicated on.'

The natives are overawed for the time; and a road is begun from New Plymouth to the newly-recovered block, and stones for the purpose are taken from a stream which flows *between the two, but through the intervening native strip*. This proceeding rouses to the uttermost the anger of the Maori: they plant ambushes; escort parties are sent out, ('*with insufficient precaution*,' says the inquest, 'seeing that the state of the district was known,') and on the fatal 4th of May Lieutenant Tragett, Surgeon Hope, and five men are massacred, and the ammunition which they were escorting is carried off. Still, Sir G. Grey hopes *to avert war*. With this view he treats the matter not as an act of hostility, though the natives insist that it is so, but simply as a murder. He, however, seizes the *intervening strip*, parcels it out among volunteers who hold by military service, and (in the hope apparently of isolating the Taranaki tribes, and giving the powerful Waikatos no ground for interference) he now restores the *Waitara* block. Naturally, however, the natives are disposed to hold together: the Waikatos get more and more restless; the bishop makes a grand speech to the 'native king' party, but fails in persuading them to give up the Tataraimaka block: 'We hold it,' say they, 'because you, who agreed to restore the Waitara if the law should turn out to be against you, have, restoring the rest, retained the parts on which your troops are stationed and your blockhouses built.' The outbreak, however, is not yet general. 'The *Wanganui* (south of lake Taupo) are divided: some three hundred have gone to the seat of war. As for the *Waikatos*, those who were on their march have gone back, but Wiremu Kingi is in close communication with *Rewi*, the head of the extreme Waikato party.'

Such was the news early in June last. Meanwhile, there is large talk of reinforcements: troops from India, even regiments of *Sikhs*, are to be sent; *at last*, General Cameron's wish (repeated so often since 1861) is fulfilled, and the militia are called out all over the islands. Lieutenant Brutton, of the 57th, *gets the Taranaki men into an ambuscade*, and kills several of them. General Cameron is universally popular, the colonial papers (in their free style) calling him 'a regular brick,' who knew how to treat the 'civilian force.' Major Logan, on the 11th of May, drives the Maori off the Tataraimaka redoubt, killing more than one hundred of them. Our native spies (who seem to be pretty

freely employed) bring news of the uncompromising hostility of all the tribes about New Plymouth : and the Waikatos have expelled all Europeans (missionaries and all) from their lands, insisting that Maori wives and half-caste children, of whom there are many, must be left behind. All this looks warlike : yet these same Waikatos are represented as *consenting to allow a steamer to be placed on their river*—‘a greater victory,’ this concession, ‘than ten thousand soldiers could have won in a year.’ On the whole, matters seem hopeful; the feeling being that Sir G. Grey’s immense *personal influence* will confine the outbreak to the district where the escort was surprised, and enable him to deal with it in some sort *judicially*, instead of making it the occasion of a general war.

The next report, gazetted in England the 20th of August, and giving news up to the 10th of June, has still to do with the New Plymouth neighbourhood. General Cameron surprises the enemy at the Katikera river; storms a redoubt, and, in spite of desperate resistance from the rifle-pits, destroys an unfortified *kainga* (village); and chases the natives along the coast, that the shells from the ‘Eclipse,’ which had been brought in there on purpose, may tell among the fugitives. Their loss was large; several being burned in their rifle-pits, our men having set fire to their ‘wharries.’ Of the troops, the report is, three dead, eight wounded. The importance, however, of this engagement is not to be estimated by the loss on either side : *it decided the Waikatos to join the war*. Young New Zealand (the supporters of the *king*) and old New Zealand (those who had never really loved the white man) at once joined and agreed to send five thousand men to the war. General Cameron determines to be beforehand with them, withdraws his troops from the outlying position at Tataraimaka, leaves a strong garrison in New Plymouth, and fixes his camp at *Drury*, between Auckland and the Waikato river. *Thus the scene of conflict is entirely shifted* : we are merely acting on the defensive in the Taranaki country; the *Waikato*, not the *Waitara*, becomes the important river. Any map gives these two rivers; but *Drury* the reader will have to fix for himself, unless he has a map of the seat of war. It is nearly two-thirds of the way (twenty miles) down a line drawn from Auckland, to the bend in the Waikato river. The excitement among the settlers is of course great, the colonial press is very violent, a strong party being loud in their condemnation of ‘the policy which has pampered and petted the interesting savages, who left off man’s flesh at the bidding of the missionaries.’ The next advices bring us to the middle of July. *Rewi* had long been meditating mischief; and now he urges

the Waikatos to resent the advance of our men towards their frontier. This they do in the usual manner, by laying ambushes, first cruelly murdering two settlers who were hewing timber, and then falling on an escort of fifty men commanded by Captain Ring, and cutting off four of them.

Thus war begins with the Waikatos in good earnest. General Cameron gets across the border on the 15th of July: the natives retreat to *Koheroa* at the river bend, where on the 17th *the first regular fight takes place*. The enemy are shelled and bayonnetted out of their rifle-pits with great loss: several chiefs are among the dead; we only lose two killed, ten wounded. Thence the General pursues them in a north-westerly direction, following a stream which comes down the Pukoho Pass, in the range which separates the Thames and Waikato valleys. The enemy desert their village, (*Paparata*,) and retreat into thick jungle. This brings us to July 24th; at which date we learn that even *William Thompson*, our old friend, was collecting troops, and had warned the Europeans to 'clear out.' In consequence of this, Archdeacon Brown and the old established residents at Tauranga (on the east coast) had come into Auckland. Meanwhile enthusiasm is on the increase—volunteers from Australia coming in, the Auckland papers suspending publication, because printers, compositors, and all are on duty. Fresh butcheries (which the Maoris regard as instances of superior skill in war) stimulate the war feeling to madness: 'the enemy's tactics are sudden murder: 'they shoot a settler at Wairoa, and actually roast the body.' 'For forty miles south of Auckland the country is one vast camp.' The *Times* at home (October 15th, 1863) praises the zeal of the colonists, and says:—

'If the Colonial Office chose to take the Maoris under its protection, the least it could do was to prevent their committing outrages on the settlers, *whose hands it tied*.....It is time that those forty thousand Englishmen and women, whose lives and properties are every day exposed to the vindictiveness of their savage neighbours, should cease to be hampered in their defence by the fancies of people on this side of the globe. The colonists are now in arms to defend themselves against a cold-blooded scheme of extermination. The crime is so patent that even Bishop Selwyn has not a word to say for the natives.'

Nor is the colonial press less bitter. The New Zealand *Advertiser* is anxious to extend the war: the southern tribes of North Island are, it alleges, not to be depended on.

'They may be kept quiet awhile by the same policy of concession

and bribery towards semi-savages which has brought about this explosion; but they will show their true character as soon as it suits their purpose to do so.'

More skirmishes, still in the same neighbourhood, bring us to the date of the latest advices.

Our casualties are strangely few, considering the amount of powder and shot wasted on us by the Maoris; they are shocking marksmen, and their guns seem mostly such as traders generally supply to aborigines. The November mail brought in news up to the 31st of August. Nothing decisive had been done in the field. The war drags slowly on as usual from pah to pah in a very difficult country. Natives were reappearing in Taranaki, carrying off sheep, &c. The 'Avon' is regularly plying on the Waikato, having been made bullet-proof. The natives fire on her occasionally; they have a cannon or two (taken from some wreck); from these they shoot a charge of pellets of all kinds, some of their shot being made of copper money which they have for some time been gathering in exchange for silver. On August 24th, a party of Maoris seized the arms of a working party of the 20th regiment, at a place just south of Drury; but they did not get (what they most want) the ammunition. The interest of the war concentrates round *Meremere*, a strong native position between the Waikato and a tributary stream: this place is fortified with rifle-pits, &c., and defended by swamps behind. News just come in (December 5th) tells us that General Cameron has attacked it. The next we are told is, about 'the forty acre pah,' at Paetai, higher up the Waikato, on a point of land between the river and the lake Waikere. If the enemy defend this in force, the war, it is to be hoped, may be ended; for (judging by the map) we should say that troops can be brought round the lake so as to cut them off completely in the rear. Meanwhile, Sir G. Grey's edict about *confiscating lands* gives mingled satisfaction and displeasure. Many say that it has justly alarmed all the natives, making them feel that 'this is the war of races,' and that if they do not help now, it will be too late: the governor is blamed for his vagueness in not specifying whose lands are to be confiscated, or to what extent. However, the purpose in view, of bringing in Australian volunteers, seems abundantly fulfilled. From the official correspondence, it appears that our colonial secretary quite approves of these vigorous measures of Sir G. Grey, and also of *his having put the natives under the control of the Colonial Assembly*. 'The endeavour,' he writes, 'to keep the natives under the Home Government has failed; and it can only be mischievous to retain a shadow of responsi-

bility when the beneficial exercise of power has become impossible.' Thus the Maoris have ceased for the present, at least, to be under the direct protection of the crown. Three years of military service entitle to a grant of land.

As to the natives in other districts, there had been a great meeting at Wellington, on the occasion of the calling out of the militia; the Maoris expressed their determination not to see the 'king' movement put down, and the English superintendent, Dr. Featherston, was very firm with them. There seemed ill-feeling on both sides; the natives were not to be allowed to go about without a pass. At Hawkes' Bay, on the contrary, all were anti-kingite, and ready to fight for the settlers. General Cameron bears testimony to the valuable help he has received from the chiefs Kukutai and Te Wheoro. The great rents some of these people get for lands round Auckland and elsewhere (in Ahuhiri province alone as much as £10,000 a year) must tend to keep them peaceable. In the southern island the natives have held a '*runanga*,' to petition against the conduct of some English, 'unworthy men, who stroll about our villages, dealing out threatening words, seeking to mix us up in the affairs of the north.' It must be the earnest prayer of every thoughtful Christian, that the settlers may have patience, and may not yield to the temptation, (natural enough under so many provocations) of turning in blind retaliation on the whole native race.

Our readers are now in a position to see how things actually stand in New Zealand. We have said very little about our own feelings on the subject: it will be readily understood, that we deeply deplore the war, and the conduct which made it necessary. We are far from thinking that the colonists are free from blame; but we certainly do not (like Archdeacon Hadfield) think that the Maori have been treated with injustice by the government: rather, we must say, a nervous anxiety has been shown to respect their rights. We have before us Mr. Heaphy's map (contained in the *Further Papers*, laid before the House of Commons in July, 1862.) It shows the unvarying care with which, in all the ceded lands, *districts are reserved by government for the benefit of the natives*, the ceded districts themselves being very small as compared to the large mass of country still retained by the tribes. Mr. Heaphy shows most clearly,* that *it is not the pressure of colonisation* which has forced on this outbreak. The Maori, at most fifty thousand, have over twenty-two millions of acres against some seven

* *Further Papers*, &c., p. 41.

millions held by the forty thousand British. The tribes near and north of Auckland, who have given up most land, are of all 'the most friendly to the government: they are far too busy in bringing their produce to our markets to care for interfering.' No other aborigines have ever had a tithe of the consideration which has always been shown to the Maori: England has certainly no great cause for self-reproach in regard to them. If they are steadily diminishing in numbers, they have been so since 1830, 'from causes inherent in the race,' surely not from any ill-treatment they have received at our hands. It even seems doubtful whether intercourse with Europeans has in this case been productive of those evils which generally arise from the mixture. Men who have lived long in the country tell us that the natives must have been far more numerous in old times: it does not seem certain whether, in judging by the very frequent remains of abandoned forts, they have made allowance for the migratory habits which led the Maori to 'move on' as soon as the land round their paha began to fail in its yield. Anyhow, two causes seem sufficient to account for the decrease: first, *change of food*; the potato, a fatal gift from Captain Cook, causing scrofulous disorders, and bringing about a weak habit of body; then *change of abode*. The old paha were all on hills, dry and healthy. Since the white man came, and the musket has superseded the war club, the natives have taken to live in low-lying places, where the life is less laborious than the old life of the paha,—coming down armed at daybreak to work in the fields, and marching up again at night. Their wretched sweltering huts, built on swamps, have told fearfully on their health; in some places old colonists tell us '*they have died like rotten sheep*.' Add to this the partial change to European habits, the plenty for a few days, while living in Auckland, followed by months of semi-starvation in the bush, and we have causes enough to account for a lamentable fact, without seeking the reason of it in the malice of the colonists. If we may venture to say so, our conviction is that the natives have been treated as children are too often treated—they have been *managed* and *spoiled*; not taught to trust to our laws, and look up to a settled principle of unvarying policy, which they would have grown to respect, but to trust to the governor, and, when frequent changes taught them that he was not always backed by those at home, to look to the Queen's authority as something which should protect them from the governor himself.

Here at home we had perhaps grown to think (except those of us who have heard otherwise from friends out there) of the native as being far more thoroughly Christianised and civilised

than he really is. After all, however, he is perhaps no worse, in some respects he may be better, than were the machine-breakers of Lancashire forty years ago. He has his 'Charter'; he has his theory of rights; he conceives himself to have been wronged; he seems to see the ruin of his race impending unless his theory can be carried out. He is wrong, undoubtedly; and has made a poor return for much consideration and kindness. But Europeans, even Englishmen, have instigated and supported him; and clergymen and theorists defend him still.

Sad indeed it is to feel that years must elapse before the missions of the Wesleyans and the Church of England can recover their old efficiency, and those who are now deadly foes or hollow friends once more heartily unite in His love in whom there is 'neither barbarian, Scythian, bond, nor free.'

We hope and believe that this will be the final struggle; for, sentimentalism apart, the world cannot wait for the Maoris. If they adapt themselves, as they have abundant light and knowledge to enable them to do, to the circumstances under which they are brought into connexion with European civilisation, it will be a happy thing for them that the white men landed on their island. But if they stand aloof, and, after years of trial, continue treacherous and regardless of human life, fickle and unamenable to law and order, they must be made to succumb, and will ultimately disappear. When we look calmly at the matter, we cannot help feeling that they are in reality less deserving of pity than the miserable aborigines of Tasmania, swept away remorselessly by a civilisation which it was hopeless to expect them to understand. The Maoris are not savages; they have not been slow to recognise the value of many of our arts; they have the wit to avail themselves of very much that has been brought under their notice; they are keen traders, and on all points excessively alive to their own interests. We cannot afford to give them what they want, to abandon the greater part of the Northern Island, so rich in mineral as well as agricultural wealth, to the old idle unproductive life of the pah and the common hunting-ground. We must make New Zealand the Britain of the South, must work its mines, dig out its coal, build houses of its forests, use its unlimited water power for a thousand industrial purposes. If they like to help us heartily in all this, we will live with them, side by side, as brethren: but then they must be true to their bargains; they must not think that when a parcel of land has been sold, and arrangements made, and scores of English families put on the move, they can then turn suddenly round and, under

colour of some *tribal right*, (which, whether it has any real existence or not, was never thought of before,) claim to annul the former bargain on the strength of which many perhaps had broken up their homes and begun to cross the ocean. The fact is, we do not set so much store as some are disposed to do by *tribal right*. A recent writer* is most instructive in this, that he shows the subtlety of the natives in their land transactions, the continual objections made with a view to gain, the new claims constantly starting up; numerous according to the supposed 'softness' of the would-be purchaser. We cannot but believe that a good deal of the land difficulty has arisen in the same way in which the Pakeha Maori describes the growth of the entanglements which seemed to bid fair to hinder his becoming a purchaser of land. The natives had been somewhat weakly indulged; they came to think that the government was weak, and that the Pakehas were afraid of them; and they acted accordingly. It is unfortunate that in dealing with New Zealanders (as with orientals) we must show that, while we are determined to be just, we are also strong, and determined to assert our rights. Had we done this sooner, we should have had a less difficult task than we shall have now. In the Heki war the Maori got the impression that we could not hurt them in the field: it will take time for General Cameron to beat this notion out of them.

Do not let it be supposed, that we imagine the fate of the natives to be hopeless extermination; we would trust that a far different lot is in store for them. They have not the obstinacy of the Red Indian. The Maoris have shown that they *can* improve; they have to learn that they must do so. We have first to read them a severe lesson. It must be sharp and decisive, else we shall have trouble by and by; sentimentalism now would be cruelty instead of kindness to those who are sure to interpret as *fear* what we mean as mercy.

We cannot argue with men who have murdered some settlers, and 'have forced others to pay a poll-tax, acknowledge the Maori king, and curse the queen.' So long as these murders are unpunished, and this rebellion rampant, few Englishmen will be disposed to enter into a calm discussion of the causes of this unhappy struggle.

As we have said, *a great deal has been done for the Maori* in the way of material advantages. Years ago, at Sir G. Grey's suggestion, the colonial legislature voted £7,000 a year for seven years for native education, and as much for general

* *Old and New Zealand.* By a Pakeha Maori. 1863.

purposes, such as medical treatment, magistrates, Maori newspapers, model farms, &c. Nor has this been entirely without result; for though most of their habitations are still the same stifling huts as in Captain Cook's day, yet some have built themselves pretty cottages, and at Otaki they have erected a place of worship which is really a marvel of native skill and perseverance. Many of them have bought little freeholds from the crown, instead of living in the old wasteful scrambling fashion, cultivating the *tribe land* in common, and moving off when the soil got exhausted. Not a few of them own horses, coasting craft, farm stock, &c., and some have actually accounts at the Auckland and Wellington banks. This is something: and when we consider that, in addition to this, the priceless truths of Christianity have been brought near to them all, we shall not say that the coming of the Pakeha among them has been in vain.

What they do want, what we must take blame to ourselves for not having given them, is law and order. We call them subjects of the queen; but practically, as Sir George Browne says,* 'some of the most populous districts have no magistrates resident among them, and many *have never been visited by an officer of government.*' As to the original merits of the case, it scarcely becomes any one at this distance, and amid such conflicting and *ex parte* statements, to pronounce dogmatically. We are not prepared to strike the balance of evidence; all we can do is, accepting the unhappy facts, to trust that in God's providence the cause of civilisation, and above all the cause of Gospel truth, will ultimately be set forward, even by this war; that the Maoris, chastened by misfortunes, will be less boastful, less overreaching, more full of the spirit of that Bible of which they so glibly quote the letter; and that the colonists also will for the future be more patient, more kindly, feeling that their superior civilisation renders applicable to them those words of the apostle, 'We that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak.' No doubt both sides are in the wrong: if the struggle now going on ends, as we hope it may end, in both coming to a better mind, not bearing malice, but determining to live together in real harmony for the future, we shall have one more fulfilment of the psalmist's words, 'The fierceness of man shall turn to Thy praise.' When peace and order are fully restored, we hope to see the 'native department' entirely remodelled, the number of officers increased, and the service made attractive to intelligent Englishmen, instead of being the

* *Memorandum*, 25th of May, 1861.

reverse. The *native tenure* must gradually be replaced by crown grants to individuals. This may be a very slow process; it was so in Ireland; but it is necessary, if we would fuse native and settler into one population capable of being under the same law. At present, the children taught are generally drawn from their homes for a time, and then let go back to relapse into their old habits; instead of this, we hope to see schoolmasters, who can speak Maori, and who know something of farming or of some useful arts, settled in the native *kaingas*. Further, we must *have* (as we said so long ago as 1861) *chiefs appointed to responsible positions*;—the wisdom of this policy has been proved in India;—we must have an impartial crown lawyer to investigate land questions, and an office where all titles may be registered in the names of competent trustees.

Then we may hope that material prosperity will go on increasing, and that Maori and Pakeha will work shoulder to shoulder in the task of making this fertile and richly endowed island truly the Britain of the South.

We cannot bring these remarks to a close more appropriately than by quoting the Duke of Newcastle's words, which (though addressed to the late governor in September, 1861) still embody the wish which must be nearest to the heart of every one who loves both Maori and colonist, and would fain see them united in Christian brotherhood. He writes: 'It would be sad indeed to allow a sanguinary war to spring up in order to *settle a question of language* with tribes who do not understand the significance of the terms they use, or of those which we offer for their acceptance. Whatever those terms may be, I hope, with Sir W. Martin, that just and effective government, *by giving the natives what they are blindly feeling after*, will eventually throw the king movement into the shade.' He would have a large force in the island, not to terrify the Maoris, *but to give them confidence in us*, by showing that we are not oppressive nor vindictive, while they are at our mercy. He would give power, dignity, and emolument to the chiefs, who, governing in concert with the queen's officers, *must* fall more and more under European influence, who will, in fact, (like the Highland chiefs after the '45,) gradually cease to hold any power hostile to settled authority. It is not too late to hope that this wish of the colonial secretary may yet (in spite of all that has happened) be realised.

We have now (December 15th) fresh news, up to October 3rd. Meremere is not yet taken; but a remarkable change has taken place in our tactics, our troops are growing skilful in the

bush, and *flying columns* are the order of the day. These scour the country, weary the natives out, (they have come to use marbles for shot, eyelet holes and matches for percussion caps, and must get all their food carried on the backs of women,) lay ambuscades, cut off stragglers—in short, carry out a system equally distinct from General Pratt's slow method of sap and advance, by fortifying redoubts, and from the useless gallantry of storming pahs, from which the enemy escapes on the other side. In spite of the death of Mr. Armitage, and of Captain Swift, who was sent to bring him off, and of a few more casualties, this mode of warfare promises well: the general impression on the spot seems to be that the flying columns (Lieutenant-Colonel Nixon's and others) will so far surround the enemy as to render a retreat *en masse* impossible: the natives will then break up into straggling parties, and be reduced in detail. Some, however, think that we shall make a grand detour, occupy all the outlets, and then end the war by storming this Maori Sebastopol. At present the natives have free egress; parties from Meremere carry off provisions, meet our flying columns, fall on settlers, &c.

ART. VIII.—*Vie de Jésus*. Par ERNEST RENAN, Membre de l'Institut. Paris: Michel Levy Frères.

THIS book has created deep and wide-spread interest alike on the Continent and in our own country. The theme of the book is one of transcendent importance. Whilst it controverts and repudiates everything supernatural or miraculous in the history of our Lord Jesus Christ, and *tanto magis* His proper Deity, it reconstructs for us His history denuded of His Divine glory, with a most cunningly exquisite grace, in accordance with the stern conditions of the *soi-disant* high criticism of our age. The book is written with that consummate art, delicate poesy, sentiment, and thorough scholarship, which have distinguished the previous productions of M. Renan, and placed him in the first rank of living writers. It is undoubtedly the worthiest and greatest work of a purely infidel cast which has been written this century.* Written, moreover, with a warm luxuri-

* We do not except Strauss's *Life of Jesus*, in which there is much more trenchant vigour and more minute elaboration, but which is so thoroughly vitiated by the monstrous hypothesis in which it is rooted, and is so far removed by its severe intellectualism from the sphere of religious emotions, that its scientific value, in attempting an explanation of the Gospel history of Jesus and of the rise of Christianity from purely natural causes, cannot be compared with the work of M. Renan.

ousness of style, and a subtle refinement of feeling which is almost feminine, and charms the reader's sensibilities like a perfume, it will insinuate its infidelity into many minds which a hard or flippant dogmatism would revolt. And issued in our country at a time when so many clerical harbingers have been labouring to unsettle the Christian faith of their countrymen, and to prepare the way for this beautiful Avatar of modern infidelity, we do not conceal from ourselves the welcome it will receive, the evil it will work. We purpose accordingly to subject this book to a grave, prolonged, and searching criticism. We do so not only because of the seriousness of the occasion which we deem the publication of this book to present,—M. Renan's authority, the truth imperilled, and the insidiousness of the danger, conspiring to augment its gravity,—but also because this book resumes within itself, and exhibits in a palpable and luminous form, certain tendencies of our age which we desire to signalise to our readers, as without an acquaintance with these tendencies it is impossible to interpret the extraordinary religious phenomena of the present time, and especially to explain either the conception and elaboration of such a work as the *Vie de Jésus* by a scholar like M. Renan, or the *éclat* that has hailed its appearance. The first of these general influences which are flowing like currents over the educated mind of Europe is the result of what is called in France *la renaissance religieuse*, 'the religious revival.' In every country of Europe a glorious contrast presents itself between the earnest, glowing, it may be struggling, religious vitality of the present century, and the cold, frivolous, atheistic formalism of the last century. In England the growth and fervour of Methodism, the spread of Puseyism, and the kindling zeal of evangelical Churchmen, bear witness to this truth. The Pietism of Berlin and Germany, the Methodism of Geneva, give the same witness. The revival and ascendancy of Ultramontanism in Catholic countries, however, give the most astonishing proof of the new spirit that animates the nineteenth century. The powers of the priesthood are exalted, the churches and confessionals are thronged, a very much deeper feeling of superstitious attachment to the Papal Church and her ministers prevails among the masses of the Catholic countries (with, perhaps, the exception of Italy) than could have been dreamt of last century or in the beginning of this. Now let it be understood that the true explanation of this fact is to be found in the revulsion of the human soul from the blank atheism which the Propaganda of wits and philosophers diffused among the people before and during the French Revolu-

tion, and the awakening of the religious sentiment, which may for a time be obscured, but which never can die. Eloquently and truly has Emile Saisset set forth this truth. 'So long as our earthly life never yields us perfect happiness, so long as there is in man, together with his reason which meditates upon the mysteries of eternity, an imagination which can realise them in anticipation, a heart which trembles in presence of the Unknown, and that mysterious and profound disquietude which no reasoning can wholly allay, religion will be the most sublime sentiment of the human heart and the most powerful force in social life. These are truths of all times and places. Let any one, therefore, now carry himself back to the moral state of France after the storms of the Revolution; if he thinks of the venerable religious customs of the people which were violently broken down,—of that religious sentiment which is yet stronger than these customs, crushed by tyranny,—of a clergy, which scepticism had enervated, recovering in the midst of persecutions the virtues of the early Church and the sympathies of the people; if he thinks of the many illusions that had vanished, of the many hopes that were disappointed, of the blood that was shed, of the many unforeseen ills that had fallen, and were now irreparable,—then, reviewing all these causes, I am afraid that this great movement of *la renaissance religieuse* which has left its literary date in the *Génie du Christianisme*, and its political date in the Concordat, can give him no cause of astonishment.'*

There are two facts connected with this great Catholic revival, as it is vauntingly styled, which have further to be noted. Its influence has not confined itself to the masses of the people in the Catholic countries of Europe: it has given a bias and a tone, which are every day becoming more manifest, to the studies and writings of the scholars of these countries—pre-eminently

* *De la Renaissance Religieuse*, page 264 of *Mélanges d'Histoire, de Morale et de Critique*, par Emile Saisset. Paris: 1859. Renan himself thus expresses the same truth. After saying, 'Whatever restrictions we may make as to the seriousness and depth of the religious revival of which we are all witnesses, it cannot be denied that there is hidden in it an event of real moral import,' he continues:—'What leads men back to the Church is the eternal instinct which leads man to a religious faith, an instinct so imperious that, in order not to remain in doubt, men accept that faith which they find ready made for them. The eighteenth century, whose mission it was to clear the field of human thought from a heap of obstructions which the course of ages had accumulated, carried into that work of demolition the ardour which is always put into a work of duty. But the next generation, which, returning to the inner life, has discovered in it the need of believing and of being in a communion of faith with others, has not comprehended the joy of that destructive ardour, and rather than remain in a system of negation which has become intolerable, it has attempted to restore the very same doctrines which their fathers had destroyed.'

of France. The indifference and materialism of the Encyclopædists have quite vanished from the highest French literature. With the exception of the well-known work of Michelet, entitled *Du Prêtre, de la Femme, et de la Famille*, and the cold glittering essays of the young and brilliant Taine, we could not point to any writings of living authors, which perpetuate the style of Voltaire and Diderot; and even these exceptions are greatly modified by the higher spirit of the age. Though pantheism colours the speculations of the most renowned writers, yet all of them manifest the reverence and earnestness of a religious sentiment. Some few years ago, religious subjects were tabooed in the *Revue de deux Mondes*; as M. de Pressensé informs us, the editor's refusal to the introduction of such subjects being couched in the words, '*Il n'y a pas d'actualité*' in them. Now scarce a number appears without a brilliant monograph on some distinct religious theme. Studies connected with the religions of mankind, and especially with Christianity, seem to have a fascination for the leading thoughtful writers of France. The names of Guigniaut, Quinet, De Remusat, Maury, Nicolos, Colani, Emile Saisset, Laboulaye, Montegut, Rigault, Jules Simon, Vacherot, and Renan, will immediately suggest to those acquainted with French literature the space and prominence that religious speculations have recently held in that literature, and the distinction of the men who have engaged in them. But the religious sentiment which confessedly animates the writings of such of these distinguished scholars as are Catholics is profoundly Catholic. The difference between a Protestant and a Catholic thinker who have been respectively trained in Protestant and Catholic communities, is not to be estimated by the mere divergence or antagonism of their opinions. It is a generic difference of religious feeling. The associations that have subtly woven themselves around the fibres of their moral nature; the form of religious truth that has occupied and coloured their imagination; the thoughts that have touched and thrilled the sensibilities of their heart;—all these are radically different, and their combined influence goes to produce, even in men who have cast off the dogmatic faith in which they were nurtured, modes of religious sentiment which contrast vividly with each other, and which reveal their immense disparity in every conception they form of religious truth, and the discussion of every problem in religious history. A man whose Protestant training brought his mind into immediate contact with the moral discipline and the spiritual truth of the Bible, and whose worship was directed to the Father through the Son, can never assimilate

late himself with a man whose first and strongest religious sympathies were wound upon an image of the Holy Virgin, or of the *Saint Cœur*, and whose young imagination was fed by the mystic romances of the *Lives of the Saints*. The difference between the clear breeze of heaven and the warm incense of the oratory, is not greater than the difference between the religious sentiment that may linger in the soul of these men even after the expiring of their faith. We venture to affirm that no Protestant could have written M. Renan's *Vie de Jésus*. But we must study to appreciate the influence of the Catholic training of M. Renan, in order to estimate and criticise his work.

Another tendency in our age is manifested in the growth and pretensions of historical criticism, or, as it sometimes styles itself, *high criticism*. Now we cannot better express the growth and arrogance of this new science than by quoting an introductory passage from M. Renan's article on *The Critical Historians of Jesus*.

'Study,' he says, 'the march of criticism since the Restoration, you will see it, always following the line of its inflexible progress, replace, one after another, the superstitions of an imperfect knowledge by the truer images of the past. A certain regret appears to attend every step that is made along this fatal way; but in truth, there is no one of those gods, who have been dethroned by criticism, who does not also receive from criticism more legitimate titles to adoration. It is at first the false Aristotle of the Arab and of the commentators of the Middle Age, which falls under the blows of the Hellenists of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and gives place to the authentic and original Aristotle; then it is Plato who, raised up for a while by the scholastic peripateticism, preached at Florence as the Gospel, finds his true titles to glory in descending from the rank of a revealer to that of a philosopher. Then it is Homer, the idol of ancient philology, who now appears to have descended from the pedestal on which he stood three thousand years, and assumes his proper beauty in becoming the impersonal expression of the genius of Greece. Then it is premature history, hitherto accepted with a gross realism, which becomes so much better understood as it is more severely discussed. A courageous march from the letter to the spirit; a difficult interpretation, which substitutes for the legend a reality a thousand times more beautiful, such is the law of modern criticism.

'It was inevitable that criticism, in this ardent research into the origins of mankind, should encounter that collection of works, products more or less pure of the Hebrew genius, which, from Genesis to the Apocalypse, form, according to the point of view one takes, either the most honourable of sacred books or the most curious of literatures. To arrest the human spirit on that slope was impossible.

However, as orthodoxy was still the law of the exterior life, and even of the most of consciences, it was believers who first essayed biblical criticism. Vain illusion, which proves at least the good faith of those who undertook that work, and the fatality which drags the human spirit, once set on the ways of rationalism, to a rupture with tradition, which at first it avoids.'—*Etude d'Histoire Religieuse*, pp. 135–137.

This march of critical science in history is a phenomenon of high significance. The laws of cautious, inductive investigation which have effected such marvellous discoveries in physical science, have been applied with equal enthusiasm and success to the domain of historical research. Vast treasures have been unearthed from their hiding-places in distant regions, and heaped together for the analysis of the scholar. New mental appliances for the study of human history have been discovered, and rapidly improved; such as comparative ethnology, philology, and mythology. And inductive science, with its rigorous probation, its contempt of prescriptive authority, and its slow tentative processes, has doubtless cleared away much of the legendary mist which hung over the ancient traditions of every land and people, and illumined for us in many places the actual scenes of the early life of man. There is now a science of history. That science allures many of the noblest minds of our time, because of the intrinsic nobleness of the study, which is the study not of matter, but of man; and every European literature is continually enriched by master-works of historical criticism.

There are, moreover, two systems of philosophy which have exercised predominating influence on the intellectual movements of our age, and which combine to place the philosophy of history, based upon historical criticism, as the culminating science which crowns and completes the monument of human knowledge. These are positive philosophy and the ideal pantheism of Hegel. Without some knowledge of these two systems and their transcendent influence on modern thought, we cannot comprehend so as to criticise and to combat the infidelity which unhappily reigns in modern science, and especially in historical science. Positive philosophy, according to the famous classification of science by its founder Auguste Comte, gives the last and the highest place to Sociology, a science which we understand better under the title Philosophy of History. He shows that sciences have originated in development from each other, and consequently in a series of necessary successions; as M. Littré shows in his last work, that if we consider the *ensemble* of what is called nature, we perceive there three

distinct groups. The first is the mathematico-physical group—that is to say, properties or physical forces, with their numerical conditions, both geometrical and mechanical. The second is the chemical group, with its mutual intermolecular actions. The third is the vital group, with the vital properties. These sciences cannot be arranged otherwise; for the vital group supposes the two former, since vital properties always include and are added to the chemical and mechanical properties of matter. In like manner the chemical group supposes the physical, but the physical group supposes nothing. Such is the order which philosophy receives at the hands of nature, and which it reproduces in what M. Comte has called the hierarchy of sciences, and which may be thus arranged :—

MATHEMATICS—STUDY OF NUMBERS—GEOMETRY—MECHANICS.

Science of Unorganized Bodies.	{ Astronomy.
	{ Physics.
	{ Chemistry.

Science of Organized Bodies....	{ Biology.
	{ Sociology.

Passing from what is abstract and general, the notions of space and number, to the simplest forms of the concrete, viz., unorganized bodies, and again by the same law to what is more complicated, to organized bodies, he ends at last in what he deems the most difficult, involved, and comprehensive science, the science of Sociology,—the study of mankind in their social relations and development. This classification of the sciences is admirable, and has been accepted by many who do not adopt the philosophy of Comte. But it has not been sufficiently seen that the whole scope and bearing of this philosophy is to magnify and enhance the critical study of human history, as we might have expected in a disciple of St. Simon. Comte himself—M. Littré informs us*—was wholly engrossed with the social applications of his philosophy.

The first work he wrote has this preliminary notice: 'This work will be composed of an indeterminate number of volumes, forming a succession of distinct writings, but which will be harmonised among themselves, and will all have one direct aim,—either to show that civil polity† ought to be now elevated to the rank of the sciences of observation, or to apply

* *Auguste Comte et sa Philosophie Positive.* Par E. Littré.

† *Politique* is as wide in its signification as *policeia*, and denotes the internal arrangements or economy of a state.

this fundamental principle to the reorganization of society.* And consequently they contain a scientific *coup d'œil* of the laws which have presided over the march of civilisation. In like manner, Mr. J. S. Mill, the great English positivist, exalts specially the resources which the positive philosophy must inevitably supply to the knowledge of history, and to the direction of human society,—subjects intimately connected. It is not so much the bias which positive philosophy has given towards the study of the laws of human development in society, or of human history, as the *method* which it has introduced into that study, and which gains general acceptance. Human history is purely a natural phenomenon. Its evolution and development is the result of certain forces inherent in human societies, the foundation of all which is the condition that scientific notions are 'accumulable.' M. Comte then traces the *tableau* of this 'social evolution' of the human race, as he styles it, of which the cardinal principle is the same as that so eagerly sustained by Mr. Buckle. The progress of human civilisation is conditioned and represented by the increase of scientific knowledge. He announces the law of this human development. It consists in the passing of human societies through three stages, which are represented by three modes of human conception in view of nature and human experience. First, the theological state, in which intelligent beings like ourselves are supposed to be the authors of physical effects. Second, the metaphysical state, in which essences and first principles are introduced in place of these deities. Third, the positive state, in which only the relative phenomena known by sense or by testimony are studied, and their laws tabulated. This *loi sociologique*, however, has not produced so great an influence on modern thought as the dogma of positive philosophy,—announced by Turgot, Kant, and Condorcet, before Comte,†—that all human things are affiliated by

* *L'Avertissement du Système de Politique Positive.* Par A. Comte.

† Turgot says, 'All the ages are enchain'd to each other by the succession of causes and effects which bind the present state of the world to all those which precede it.'..... 'And the human family, considered from its origin, appears to the eye of the philosopher an immense whole, which has itself, like the individual, its infancy and progress.—*Deuxième Discours sur les Progrès successifs de l'Esprit humain*, p. 52.

Kant still more trenchantly illustrates this fatalistic law in his tractate, *The Idea of a Universal History from the Point of View of Humanity*, which he thus introduces: 'In whatever way we desire in metaphysics to represent free-will, its manifestations are in human actions determined, like every other natural phenomenon, by the general laws of nature. Two or three of the propositions of the tractate will indicate its tendency. 'Prop. 1. All the natural dispositions of a creature are determined in order to arrive finally at a complete and appropriate development. Prop. 2.

close dependence to each other, as close as the dependence of physical causes and effects, and that all the generations of men are thus rigidly bound by necessary and fatal law to each other. Thus natural laws control and regulate the march of civilisation, the development of sciences, institutions, and manners, which are constant and invariable as the laws of matter. There are conditions inherent in humanity which operate as inevitably as the forces inherent in physical nature. Now this doctrine, which is the cardinal doctrine of positive philosophy, is gaining a fatal predominance in historical studies; it is accepted as an axiom, it is the groundwork of nearly all modern investigations into human history. It is said that by it alone can history become a science. There is a large measure of truth, moreover, in this doctrine, which gives it an exceeding plausibility. But in reality it is a return to that fatalism, that conception of a blind omnipotent destiny, *ἡ εἰμαρμένη*, which is the fundamental principle of paganism, against which Christianity at its origin struggled till it overcame, and into conflict with which it again enters.

Strange to say, the influence of modern pantheism, expounded by its great hierophant Hegel and by the new Hegelian school, has in almost every respect coalesced with, and has thus mightily augmented, the influence of positive philosophy. Starting from two opposite schools, and two opposite poles of thought,—one from the abstract idealism of Kant and Fichte, the other from the materialism of St. Simon and De Broussais,—and laying hold by their first principles and their respective methods upon minds very differently constituted,—these extremes meet in precisely the same conclusions.* The influence of both these

With man, who is the only reasonable creature upon earth, the natural dispositions, whose destination is the use of his reason, must develop themselves not in the individual but in the species. Prop. 4. The means which nature uses in order to the development of all its dispositions is the antagonism of these dispositions in society; antagonism which in the end becomes the cause of a regular social order. Prop. 8. We may finally consider the history of the human race as the accomplishment of a plan concealed in nature, with the end of producing a political constitution, perfect both in its interior and exterior relations, a constitution which is the only theatre where can be developed all the dispositions given by nature to humanity.

It is in the following fashion that Comte himself speaks of Condorcet and his 'outline of an historical *tableau* of the progress of the human spirit.' 'Condorcet has been the first to see clearly that civilisation is subject to progressive development, of which all the steps are rigorously enchain'd one to the other, following natural laws; which a philosophic observation of the past can unveil, and which determine for each epoch, in a matter entirely positive, the improvements which the social state is called to make, both in its parts and in its *ensemble*.'

* It is interesting to observe their exact and astounding coincidence in reference to worship and religious faith. The atheistic materialist Diderot said long ago that all positive religions were but the heresies of natural religion. So Comte affirms that natural religion is no better than positive

systems of philosophy has been acknowledged to be profound; but it has never been observed that the enormous and almost irresistible sway which they exert over the speculations and ideas of our age arises from their concurrence and precise identity in certain fundamental dogmas and tendencies. We indicate now this identity in one or two respects. Pantheism exalts the study of human history as much as positivism, though from different causes. One sentence from Hegel will indicate what is the kernel principle of his system and of pantheism. 'The history of the world begins with its general aim, the realization of the idea of spirit, only in an implicit form, (*an sich*,) that is, as nature; a hidden, most profoundly hidden, unconscious instinct; and the whole process of history is directed to rendering this unconscious impulse a conscious one. The vast congeries of volitions, interests, and activities constitute the instruments and means of the world-spirit for attaining its object; bringing it to consciousness and realising it. And the aim is none other than finding itself, coming to itself, and contemplating itself in concrete actuality.*' The German philosophy, it is true, proclaims God under the names of the Absolute, the World-Spirit, the World-Idea. But this God, considered in itself, is but an abstraction, or rather the phantom of existence. He has not a life which is His own. He only exists in becoming everything by turns;—space, time, metals, plants, animals, and finally man. It is, however, in man that God realises and completes Himself. It is in man He becomes conscious of Himself. Consequently, the study of human history is pre-eminently the loftiest study for man. It reveals the unfolding and awakening in man of the Absolute, the only Deity.

But further. This development of the World-Spirit in nature, and finally in human history, is necessary,—determined by inevitable laws. It is not a personal and free God who rules nature and man; it is a blind undetermined Cause pro-

faiths. It belongs to the infant stage of humanity. It is a deceiving chimera of the head, or a vain and sterile abstraction of the heart. One might imagine the conclusion of this reasoning would be that all religious dogmas, sentiments, and words ought to be for ever forgotten, so that the religion of the future will be no religion. But Comte recoiled from such a finale. He acknowledged that man is a religious being, and that society without religion is impossible. Hence he sought out something which, since God is suppressed, might attract the regard and adoration of men, and sets up before Christian Europe the same new god which Feuerbach had done—the human race. Feuerbach maintains that, since, according to Hegel, God only becomes conscious in man, that consciousness and the Divine essence cannot be separated. If man has the consciousness of God, he has the essence of God—he is God. Hence his profane interpretation of the Christian dogma, *God-Man*,—God in the human race. The consciousness and being of God only exists there; so that the *human race* is the only legitimate object of worship.

* Hegel's *Philosophy of History*, translated by L. Sibree. Bohn. Page 26.

ducing all by an unthinking yet fatal process. The development of man, the growth of religion, the march of civilisation, —all these, according to pantheism, precisely as according to positivism, are the necessary sequences of preceding causes. There has been no intervention in this necessary order—no interruption of natural law. Topsy's solution of the mystery of her wild nature is the solution given by both these philosophies of the mystery of man and nature. Nothing has been made, or arranged, or disposed; there is no government by a Divine hand; everything has merely 'grown' as it is. Both these philosophies, which are now in the ascendant, unite in declaring that there has been no supernatural message or help ever given to man,—there has been no violation of the laws of nature. *A miracle is impossible.* At the same time they both, by the very genius or spirit of the philosophies themselves, by the doctrines they propound, and the aims they affect, incite to the study of every realm of human history, as the noblest and most useful field of intellectual toil.

M. Renan unites in himself, and exhibits in the clearest form, these ruling tendencies of our time. He is a positivist. In his famous article* on *The Metaphysics of Religion* by Vacherot, he repudiates and denies altogether the possibility of metaphysics. He repeatedly and most unhesitatingly declares that every fact reported as miraculous is false—that there is no miracle.† He affirms that every phenomenon in human history,

* *Revue des deux Mondes*, 15th of January, 1862.

† That we may not be thought to exaggerate this fact, let our readers peruse Emile Saisset's last work, *Essai de Philosophie Religieuse*, in which he declares—and few appreciate or lament the fact more than he—that amongst all the great currents of thought around him, there is not even one which does not go to deny the existence of a living and personal God. And M. Naville, at the close of *La Vie Eternelle*, does not hesitate thus to raise the cry of alarm: 'The struggle against that faith which is common to all Christians grows fierce and powerful around us. Its proportions increase from day to day in a manner to frighten those who follow its development. They deny God, Jesus Christ, Eternal Life. The conflict is going on in Germany, where, after an idealistic philosophy which would explain all by means of man himself without God, a gross materialism appears which would explain all by nature without spirit. The conflict has opened in France, where scientific scholars, historians, critics, appear banded together to shake the bases of all religious faith.'—*La Vie Eternelle*, p. 293.

Though the introduction to his *Vie de Jésus* seems to shrink from so firm an announcement, there can be no doubt that this is with M. Renan the primary axiom, the regulative principle of all his historical studies. On this point there must be no misunderstanding; let, then, the following passages be compared:—'The first principle of criticism is, that a miracle has no place in the web of human affairs, any more than in the series of the facts of nature. Criticism, accordingly, which commences by proclaiming that everything in history has its human explanation, even when the explication fails us for want of sufficient information, could not harmonise with the theological schools which employ a method opposed to its own, and pursue a different aim.'—*Etudes d'Histoire Religieuse*, (Introduction), p. 7.

'Criticism has two manners of attacking a miraculous narrative; for it cannot

whether in an individual or in society, is the inevitable result of certain conditions inherent in that individual, or in the society: or, in his own words, the phenomena of history are only the regular development of laws as unalterable as reason and perfection. This doctrine he applies in rigid sincerity to the history and influence of Jesus: 'A more extensive view of the philosophy of history will thus make us understand that the true causes of Jesus are not to be sought outside of humanity, but in the bosom of the moral world; that the laws which have produced Jesus are not exceptional and transitory laws, but the permanent laws of the human consciousness.'*

M. Renan is still more pronounced as a pantheist. The hard, irreligious secularism of the positive philosophy would not attract many minds, in this age, when there is so powerful a *renaissance* of religious sentiment felt in society. It is the alliance of pantheism, which allows and fosters a certain self-satisfying religiosity of feeling, with positivism, and their identity in scientific methods, pampering the vanity of the human intellect, as pantheism indulges the proud self-deifying religiousness of the human heart, which fascinate with so strong an allurements men like M. Renan. His pantheism, however, is open and daring, though it might not be detected by an unsuspecting reader of the *Vie de Jésus*. Let our readers peruse these passages, which 'arrange in order God—Providence—Immortality,—so many good old words, perhaps a little gross, (*un peu lourds peut-être*,) which philosophy will interpret in senses more and more refined.'† 'Eternal beauty will live for ever in that sublime name, (that of Jesus Christ,) as in all those which humanity has chosen in order to

dream to accept it as such, since its very essence is the denial of the supernatural.' (*Etudes*, p. 37.) 'All controversy between those who believe in the supernatural and those who do not, is bootless. We must say of miracles, what Schleiermacher said of angels. We cannot prove their impossibility. However, the entire conception of them is such that it could not proceed from our time; it belongs exclusively to the idea which antiquity formed of the world. It is not from the process of reasoning, but from the *ensemble* of modern sciences, that this immense result is deduced, that there is no supernatural. Since there has been any being all that has occurred in the world of phenomena has been the regular development of the laws of being, laws which constitute only one order of government; the natural, whether it be physical or moral.' (*Etudes*, &c., pp. 206, 207.) Further compare p. 178: 'There is no history, if we do not comprehend the non-reality of miracles:' p. 199: 'The miracle is only the unexplained;' also p. 200; and, indeed, the whole of the essay on *The Critical Historians of Jesus*. In like manner, in his *Vie de Jésus*, despite this hesitant Introduction, which we shall hereafter examine, he does not hesitate afterwards to say, 'Physical and physiological sciences have demonstrated to us that all supernatural vision is an illusion.' (*Vie de Jésus*, p. 74.)

* *Etudes d'Histoire Religieuse*, p. 208.

† *Ibid.*, p. 419.

remind itself of what it is, and intoxicate itself with its own image. *This is the living God. This is what we should adore.*.* 'The absolute of justice and of reason only manifests itself in humanity: regarded out of humanity, *that absolute is only an abstraction*; regarded in humanity, it is a reality. *The infinite only exists* when invested in a finite form.'† 'Religion is the aspiration to the ideal.' 'A man who takes life seriously, and employs his activity in a pursuit with a generous aim, he is the religious man. A frivolous, superficial man, with no high morality, he is the impious man.'‡ Compare with these passages the whole of the article on Feuerbach, in *Etudes*, &c. Respecting immortality, the following are his clearest sentences, which are worthy of Buddhism:—'We affirm that he who will have chosen the good will have been truly wise. He will be immortal; *for his works will live* in the definitive triumph of justice. Whilst the wicked, the fool, and the fribble will wholly die, in the sense that he will leave nothing in the general result of the work of his race; the man devoted to good and beautiful things will participate in the immortality of what he loves. The works of the man of genius and of rectitude will alone escape the universal decay.'§ Compare with this the passage in *Vie de Jésus*, p. 426. In another passage of the *Vie de Jésus*, however, he seems to crave for another immortality than that of his works; the passage is remarkable:—'Those who do not stoop to conceive of man as a being composed of two substances, and who find the theistical dogma of the immortality of the soul in contradiction with physiology, love to rest in the hope of a final reparation, which under an unknown form will satisfy the want of the human heart. Who knows but that the last term of progress, in millions of ages, may bring forth the absolute consciousness of the universe, and in that consciousness the awaking of all that has lived? It is certain that moral and virtuous humanity will yet have its revenge, that one day the sentiment of the honest poor man will judge the world, and on that day the ideal figure of Jesus will be the confusion of the frivolous man, who has not believed in virtue, and of the egotistical man, who has not been able to attain it.' ||

Now to those who know the tenour of pantheistic specula-

* *Etudes d'Histoire Religieuse*, p. 215.

† *Revue des deux Mondes*, January 15th, 1860.

‡ *Etudes d'Histoire Religieuse*, p. 15.

§ *Introduction to the Book of Job*, pp. 90, 91.

|| *Vie de Jésus*, pp. 288, 289.

tion,* a better creed of pantheism could not be exhibited than in these passages. It is not for us to explain M. Renan's inconsistencies. These are his regulative beliefs, solemnly announced. Yet how replete with a species of religious feeling are all his works! This gives them an exquisite charm. He is drunken, in a sense, like Spinoza, with the Divine. Regarding all high aspirations, all heroism and sacrifice, all religious faith, all forms and productions of beauty, all morality and truth, as but the emanations—the manifestations of the Divinity in man, he expatiates in them with delight and adoration. It is the ideal in man that he worships: but so saintly and fervid are his hymns, so tenderly rich his sentiment, so reverent his homage, that his religiousness is felt to be sincere and profound. And yet to us Protestants it is inexplicable. No German or English pantheist, though devout in temperament, like M. Renan, could endure it. It has the false and hectic flush, the sickening odours of Catholic sentiment. M. Renan, though of Jewish extraction, was trained among the Jesuits. Like his compatriot, M. Lamennais, he is a native of Bas-Bretagne, where attachment to Catholic faith is intensely strong; and his early Catholic nurture, which enveloped and saturated his

* In one important respect, M. Renan's work is more purely the product of pantheistic speculation than was Strauss's; though the latter was avowedly the application of the Hegelian philosophy to biblical criticism. Strauss imputes little weight to the individuality of Jesus in the formation of the Christian legend. He thinks the name or person of Jesus is only a lay figure, on which the Messianic ideas of the time draped themselves. In that syllogism into which the argument of the book may be thrown, 'The Messiah ought to do that: But Jesus is the Messiah: Therefore Jesus has done it,' Strauss forgets that, in point of historical criticism, it is the minor premiss of that syllogism that is of the highest scientific moment. *How did the belief originate, and abide and gather widening adhesion, that Jesus is the Messiah?* How did that person attract to Himself that universal persuasion which became so deep and fervid in the minds of His own countrymen, that it led them to believe that He did works which they knew He did not do, simply because they imagined *the Messiah* would do such works? Now, to those who know Hegelian doctrine,—even as popularised by Emerson and Carlyle,—the heroes, the great men of an age, are men whose individuality, whilst it gathers up in intensest and mightiest force the spirit of that age, also reacts with an energetic personal ascendancy upon the age. They are the spiracles of the Over-Soul, as Emerson styles the pantheistic God. They are the most advanced revealers of that Spirit which is ever developing itself, through the souls of great men, into a fuller consciousness of itself; or, as Hegel, the master, phrases it:—"For that Spirit which has taken this fresh step in history is in the inmost soul of all individuals; but in a state of unconsciousness which the great men in question aroused. Their fellows, therefore, follow these soul-leaders; for they feel the irresistible power of their own spirit thus embodied." (*History of Philosophy*, p. 33.) Now, it is in this proper Hegelian fashion that M. Renan presents to us his conception of Jesus, as one of the greatest of men; whose individuality imprinted itself strongly and imperishably on the souls of His followers, and of all succeeding generations. In Him the spontaneous force, the highest intuition, the purest will of the human soul, are all revealed. He creates the legend: the legend does not create him.

opening mind, still colours and taints his conceptions of all religious truth and history in a manner which makes them, at times, revolting to Protestant thinkers. Hence arises his conception of the character and of the life of Jesus, which, notwithstanding all the adulation he bestows upon Him, is more repugnant to us than the clearer, harsher profanity of our English or even of the French Deists. A womanly amiability of heart, which dispenses with stern integrity, such as Catholicism has divinised in the Virgin Mary, and still more in the worship of the *Saint Cœur*,—and a cruel asceticism,—a Manicheism which despises the good of this life in hope of another, such as Catholicism apotheosizes in its Calendar of the Saints : these two great poles of religious sentiment in the Catholic world still abide as the polar magnets in Renan's soul ; around which all religious life centres, and upon which it hangs. That revelation of the righteousness of God in His love, which Protestantism exalts, and by which the highest and inexorable demands of the conscience are satisfied, in harmony with a fulfilment of the heart's wants, has never enlightened M. Renan. His religious sentiment is unhealthy religiousness—unrighteous sentimentality. This will be apparent to our readers when we sketch M. Renan's *tableau* of the life of Jesus ; and it is this which assures us that, whilst we consider his book the ablest attempt that has been made to construct a hypothesis of the life of Jesus, and the origin of Christianity, as phenomena produced by natural causes, it is an hypothesis which will incense the moral sense of England, and rouse a far deeper indignation than the less plausible and more dogmatic work of Strauss.

Now that we understand the principle of M. Renan, and the atmosphere in which his mind has been formed, we shall be able more intelligently and effectually to criticise his work. It is he—a positivist, a pantheist, and who has been a Catholic—a disciple of the Jesuits—who has now written the *Life of Jesus*. Let us not, however, ignore the splendid qualifications wherewith M. Renan is endowed and equipped for the task he has set himself. His life has been enthusiastically devoted to historical studies, especially to dredge the dark depths of human history, in which the origins of the great functions of humanity, viz., language, laws, and religions, are buried. His intense curiosity has fixed his mind upon the growth of religions ; and to the exploration of this profoundest, most mysterious, but noblest theme, he has made all his other acquisitions instrumental. It is thus he conceives the grandeur and the method of this inquiry : 'The religion of a people, being the most

complete expression of its individuality, is, in a sense, more instructive than its history. The religious legend is the proper and exclusive work of the genius of each human family. India, for example, has not left us one line of history, properly so called. Scholars sometimes regret it, and would pay its weight in gold for some chronicle, some table of kings. But in truth we have better than all that; we have its poems, its mythology, its sacred books—we have its soul.' 'Religions hold so deeply to the inmost fibres of human consciousness, that a scientific interpretation of them becomes at a distance almost impossible. Full of life, of meaning, and of truth, for the people who have animated them with their breath, they are nothing more to our eyes than dead letters, sealed hieroglyphics: created by the simultaneous effort of all the faculties acting in the most perfect harmony, they are for us nothing more than an object of curious analysis. To make a history of a religion, it is necessary to believe in it no more; but it is necessary to have believed in it.'*

And in his Preface to the *Etudes d'Histoire Religieuse* he thus avows his passion for these studies. He says that, in the volume, he exhibits 'the principal forms which the religious sentiment has assumed in antiquity, the middle age, and modern times. These subjects have an attraction for me which I do not dissemble, and which I cannot resist.'† In further preparation for his great work on the origin of Christianity, of which the *Vie de Jésus* is but the first instalment, M. Renan has studied very profoundly all the monuments of the Shemitic race, from which Judaism and Christianity have flowed to the world. His great work on the *General History and Comparative System of the Semitic Languages*,‡ of which hitherto the first part alone has appeared, is a witness of his marvellous industry and aptitude in this field of research. Whatever influences surrounded the cradle of nascent Christianity, and moulded in any way its manifestations, were the outgrowth of Semitic character, which was grandly featured in the Semitic tribe,—Beni Israel,—and of the developments in the heart of the Semitic people at the beginning of our era. It is universally confessed that Western civilisation—that Greek or Roman ideas—made no impression upon the purer life of the Israelites, save to close it up in a deeper seclusion and narrower concentration than in their earlier history. If M. Renan's theory be true, that Christianity was not only influenced in form, but derived in essence from

* *Les Religions de l'Antiquité*, pp. 2, 3, 6.

† Introduction, p. 6.

‡ Paris, Second Edition, 1858.

these sentiments of the Semitic people, that it was entirely the product of the inherent conditions of Israelitish society at that time; M. Renan has, more thoroughly perhaps than any other man, comprehended these conditions, and prepared himself to vindicate his theory by scientific evidence. In addition to his extensive labours among the antiquities and extant literatures of Semitic nations, he has, as he informs us in the Introduction of his *Vie de Jésus*, made special study of the Apocryphal Scriptures,—of Philo, Josephus, and the Talmud; the great sources of illumination, apart from the New Testament, upon the religious and mental condition of the Jews at the time of the Lord. Still further, he has spent months in the Holy Land, and gathered into his sympathetic spirit every influence, from climate or scenery, that might quicken or colour the sentiment of Jewish society, or of a solitary and lofty religious genius. If, then, M. Renan fails, as he has irretrievably failed, in establishing his thesis, it is because his thesis is false and undemonstrable. We regard, consequently, M. Renan's work as one of the widest and firmest ramparts built in outer defence of the citadel of Christian faith. If the *life of Jesus* cannot be restored back to those elements of thought and feeling, hung in solution in his age, and which were only crystallized in him;—if *this product* which exists is not the resultant of these inherent conditions of society in that time and country;—then, with a mighty rebound, the argument drives home the conclusion:—Since it is not a natural product, the effect of natural causes, it is supernatural. Since it is not of man, it is of God.

We need not to inform our readers that M. Renan has a magnificent prose style, and that he knows how, with the certain eye and the fine touch of a perfect artist, to chisel out his conception in statuesque and graceful form. His book is a chef d'œuvre of literary art. Each image, too, that adorns his work is luminously pure as the light of diamonds. What the imagination and grace of a poet could do in order to set off, in the harmony and verisimilitude of truth, M. Renan's ideal *Life of Jesus*, is done here. And more, there breathes throughout the book a monotone of sadness * which one cannot but feel

* It is the same feeling which gives birth to the following melancholy passage: 'Here, according to my mind, is the future, if it is to be one of progress. Shall we ever arrive at a more certain view of the destiny of man and of his relations with the Infinite? Shall we know more clearly the law of the origin of beings, the nature of consciousness, what is life and personality? Will the world, without returning to credulity, and while persisting firmly in the way of positive philosophy, recover its joy, ardour, hope, and far-reaching thoughts? Will it yet one day be worth the pain of living? and will the man who believes in duty find his reward in duty? Will that science to which we consecrate our life restore to us what we sacrifice to it?

to be a refrain from the heart of the critic who avows that he has one special qualification for acting the part of a true critic of the life of Jesus: *he has believed, but believes no more.* Yet the heart lingers tenderly over the wreck of its purest joy. The empty alabaster box has yet the sweet fragrance of the precious ointment clinging about it. This feeling awakens unconscious sympathy in the reader, and conciliates even his judgment in favour of the writer. What a work upon this highest of all human themes—the origin of Christianity—M. Renan, thus gifted and accomplished, might have achieved if his faith had survived! The one fundamental axiom of his book, which he maintains to be the foundation of all criticism, ‘that there is no miracle,’ travesties the real life of Jesus into an impossible, because unnatural, romance. In the execution of his task, to show how natural causes have produced what is supernatural, he outrages truth and probability at every step, and himself concocts an impossible, because an immoral, miracle in the character of Jesus, in order to dispense with the congruous miracles of mercy as of power which blend in the life and attest the divinity of our Lord. Assuming—for this assumption is the groundwork of the entire work—that the supernatural is false, he has necessarily to erase all that is supernatural from the Gospel records and the origin of Christianity. He has, consequently, to show that the spiritual monotheism which gave the ascendancy to Christian truth has its origin in the Semitic races; that it is a Semitic dogma, which Jesus loosened from its root-hold, and winged for universal acceptance; that the legendary stories, as he calls the miraculous narratives, are the deposit of a later age, the offspring of credulous and fervid imaginations; and that the remainder of the Gospel records may be so manipulated and humoured as to be fairly pieced together again after their miraculous portions are shred away, and to exhibit something like the original lineaments of the person of Jesus, before these miraculous glosses daubed and obscured His true image.

It is an old infidel dream revived—an old attempt renewed by most expert and cunning hands. Let us now try the issue. I. We shall rapidly sketch M. Renan's *Vie de Jésus*. II. We shall fully discuss the fundamental axiom of modern and of M. Renan's criticism, that all miraculous narratives are false. III. We shall discuss the theory as to the origin of Christian monotheism

I do not know: all that is certain is that in seeking truth by the scientific method, we shall have done our duty. If truth is sad, we shall have at least the consolation of having discovered it according to rule. It might be said that we had deserved to find it more consolatory: we shall give this witness of ourselves, that we have been absolutely sincere with ourselves.—*Discours d'Ouverture de Cours de Langue Hébraïque, 1862.*
Veritatem philosophia querit, religio habet.

which M. Renan considers the soul and living principle of Christianity,—that it is a native growth of the Semitic mind. IV. We shall criticise M. Renan's theory as to the origin of the miraculous legends of the canonical Gospels, and as to the formation of these Gospels. V. We shall undertake to prove that the *Vie de Jésus* by M. Renan is (1) not deducible from even the mangled documents, rid of all their miraculous contents, which he strangely deems quite valid and trustworthy; (2) that it is inconsistent with itself, that it is abortive as a romance, and impossible in the experience of real life; (3) that its morality is evil, and exhibits a chimera of contradictories which is monstrous. VI. We shall, in conclusion, show that M. Renan's *Vie de Jésus* yields no explanation of the origin of Christianity. It neither exhibits the source of the moral principles and influences which Christianity introduced into the world, nor the cause of the expansion and triumph and security of the Christian faith.

I. Jesus was born in Nazareth. It was a supposititious legend, based on popular Messianic ideas, that introduced the mention of Bethlehem. His parents were humble; his father a carpenter. He had many brothers and sisters. The home of his infancy and youth 'resembled much, without doubt, those poor shops we may now see in Nazareth, lighted from the door, that serve for workshop, kitchen, and chamber, and furnished only with a mat, some cushions on the ground, one or two clay vases, and a painted chest.' His education was narrow: he knew how to read and write; but it is not likely that he understood the original Hebrew of the Scriptures. Freedom of intercourse, however, in eastern and all uncivilised countries gives education to the mind, and annuls the mental difference between the literate and illiterate of modern civilisation. It is probable that he did not know the Greek language at all; and most certain that he was profoundly unconscious of all Greek science or philosophy. No element of Hellenistic culture brightened his intelligence. He was even ignorant of the developments of religious thought in the heart of Judaism;—the Essenes and Philo were unknown to him. He was happily innocent, too, of the bizarre pedantry that reigned in the schools of Jerusalem. The Jewish scholasticism, which has left its monument in the Talmud, was a sealed letter to Jesus. The popular aphorisms of the great teacher Hillel may, however, have been treasured in his memory. The great kingdoms of the world only cast a vague, troubled reflection of their grandeur upon the village youth in Nazareth. The splendours of the new temple, and the gay structures erected by the Herods

in the new cities springing by the side of the neighbouring lake, were the only symbols to his imagination of the pomp and majesty of Roman sovereignty. But nature was a pure and tender nursing-mother to this Galilean boy. M. Renan, in many exquisite vignettes, pictures for us the gay, fairy luxuriousness of Galilee, before the mournful doom of Islamism blighted its beauty. Here is one of them; but let our readers understand it is a dream of the fancy as much as the enchanted gardens of eastern tale:—‘The saddest country, perhaps, of all the world is the country round about Jerusalem. Galilee, on the contrary, is a country carpeted in green, richly shaded, and brightly smiling, the real country of “The Song of Songs,” and of the Songs of the Well-beloved. During the months of March and April, the country is one thickly-woven mass of flowers, with an incomparable freshness and strength of colouring. The animals are all small, but exceedingly gentle. The slender and lively turtle-doves, the blue ousels, so slight that they perch upon the plant without making it bend, &c. In no country of the world are the mountains grouped in more harmonious outlines, and able to inspire loftier thoughts.’

Jesus was born at a time when the Jewish world was fermenting with revolutionary hopes, which broke out occasionally in fanatical sedition; for, long before, the Messianic ideas of the people had changed. Instead of dreaming now of a Messiah who should conquer the nations into subjection to Israel, and make Jerusalem the seat of a universal monarchy, now in their despair the Jews hoped for a complete *bouleversement* of the world. They believed in the sudden end of the world, and the restoration of a new heaven and earth. And, farther, they adopted the notion of a resurrection, foreign to their old traditions, in which the people of God should rise up in the flesh to assist in the triumph of their enemies. These ideas found their expression in the apocalyptic books, especially in the books of Daniel and of Enoch. Into this burning atmosphere of feeling Jesus was born. His reading was limited to the Law and the Prophets, and these recent (according to M. Renan) apocalyptic books. It was, however, the lyric beauty of the Psalms, the solemn visions of Isaiah, and the wild imaginations of the books of Daniel and of Enoch, upon which his soul deeply mused, and which planted the seeds of which His own thoughts and life were the blossom. Jesus had no suspicion of that ‘new idea created by Greek science, which is the base of all philosophy, and which modern science has fully confirmed; viz., the exclusion of those capricious gods to whom the *naïve* credulity of olden ages attributed the government of

the world. This negation of the miraculous—this idea that everything in the world is produced by laws—was then a common maxim of all the government schools founded in all the countries which had received Greek science.' Jesus knew nothing of it. His faith was that of His country. He believed in the existence of the devil, and the possession of devils. With Jesus, however, this credulity was rooted in a profound conception of the familiar relations of man with God, and in an exaggerated idea of the power of man,—notions which 'gave Him a force over His age which no person has wielded before or since.'

This high conception of divinity forms, indeed, the true originality of Jesus, and 'forms, in some sort, the principle of all His force.' (P. 74.) 'He believed Himself in direct relation with God: He believed Himself the Son of God. The highest consciousness of God, which has dwelt in the bosom of humanity, has been that of Jesus.' (P. 75.) He did not speculate or reason about God. 'God conceived immediately as the Father, then, is all the theology of Jesus.' (P. 76.) The first conception of the kingdom of God announced by Jesus was simply this,—spiritual alliance with the Father, and was wholly different from that of the enthusiasts who believed this world was soon to perish, and who prepared for the catastrophe by asceticism.' (P. 79.) Jesus further took up the familiar proverbs of the synagogue,—those that make up the sermon on the mount,—and repeated them with the unction of a higher spirit, which made the old aphorisms new; for 'the poesy of the precept, which makes it loved, is more than the precept itself, taken as an abstract truth.' (P. 84.) 'A pure worship, without priests and without exterior practices, reposing upon the sentiments of the heart, upon the imitation of God, upon the immediate relation of the consciousness with the heavenly Father,' (p. 86,) were the substance of that doctrine He founded,—as the kingdom of God,—and which is the foundation of all true religion. (P. 90.) True Christianity was now founded. Jesus will add nothing further that is durable. Nay, He will compromise it; for every idea must make sacrifices to succeed. 'Truly, if the Gospel were confined to some chapters of Matthew and Luke, it would be more perfect, and would not be open to so many objections; but without miracles, would it have converted the world? Such is the doctrine of Jesus in this early and purest epoch of His ministry. But it was His person (an ideal picture) which influenced His hearers.' 'The voice of the young carpenter had suddenly an extraordinary sweetness: an infinite charm exhaled from His per-

son; so that those that had seen Him before did not recognise Him.' His amiable character, and, doubtless, one of those ravishing figures which sometimes appeared in the Jewish race, made a circle of fascination round about Him which no one could escape.' (P. 81.) Such was the origin of Christianity: of that spiritual movement, which has not exhausted itself after eighteen centuries have elapsed.

A second epoch in the ministry of Jesus opened with His visit to John the Baptist. John, who revived the memories of Elias the terrible prophet of Carmel, was possessed in the highest degree with Messianic hopes; and his public action derived its force from this cause. He proclaimed the coming of '*the terrible day.*' 'Penitence, of which baptism was the sign, alms, and amendment of life, were with him the great means of preparing for the impending doom.' His invectives rang out fresh and sharp against his adversaries. Jesus went with a few followers to attend John, with whom, young like Himself, He had many ideas in common. Despite His true originality, Jesus appears to have been, for some months at least, an imitator of John. He and His disciples baptized like John, and doubtless accompanied their baptism with preaching analogous to the Baptist's. Without any jealousy, Jesus wished only 'to increase under the shadow of His better known *confrère*, and thought it necessary to adopt the same means as he had done to get a crowd of followers.' The only influences for good, then, that He derived from John, were 'some lessons of preaching and popular action.' Otherwise, those influences were injurious. 'Perhaps if the Baptist, from whose authority He would have found it difficult to liberate Himself, had remained free, Jesus would not have been able to cast off the yoke of rites and of exterior practices, and then He would have doubtless remained an unknown Jewish sectary: for the world would not have abandoned one set of religious practices for another. It is by the attraction of a religion disengaged from all exterior form that Christianity has fascinated elevated minds.' (P. 115.)

But John was imprisoned, and Jesus then returned to His lovely Galilee to develop His own thoughts freely. Now, then, His doctrine hardened into more solid form: His ideas of the kingdom of God ripened: He is 'no longer the delicious moralist; He is the transcendent revolutionist who has appeared to renew the world from its bases, and found upon earth the ideal He has conceived.' (P. 116.)

Evil reigns in the world. Satan is its king, but God will

awake and avenge His saints. The kingdom of Good will have its turn. This will be a great and a sudden revolution, though its beginnings are secret—a complete reversal of all that now exists—and Jesus Himself shall effect it: for this thought ‘held to the roots of His being, that he was the Son of God, the intimate of the Father, the executor of His decrees.’ All nature, even sickness and death, are but His instruments: ‘If the earth does not yield itself to this supreme transformation, it will be ground to powder, purified by fire and the breath of God.’ (P. 119.) Yet He was no political revolutionary. (It is difficult to give M. Renan’s views of this doctrine of the kingdom of God,—they are so contradictory;—but we must reproduce the main points.) It was a moral revolution He wished to work out. In contempt for this world, ‘He founded that great doctrine of transcendent disdain, the true doctrine of liberty for the soul, which alone gives peace.’ (P. 119.) He did not know the power of the Roman empire, and so, with the vision of the enthusiast, He ‘could hope to found a kingdom by the number and boldness of His adherents.’ (P. 120.) Jesus lived now in Capernaum. He drew around Him many disciples; He openly claimed to be the Messiah, and assumed or allowed those Messianic titles, *Son of Man—Son of David*, which the Apocalyptic books had familiarised to the ear and heart of the people. Most richly and graphically does M. Renan paint the Galilee of that time; its lake, its mountains, its villages, its gardens, and its clear warm heaven. Here is an example. After describing the women and children who came to Jesus, and the disciples that formed the first and faithful *cortège* of the young Reformer, who styled Himself the Messiah,—

‘Such,’ he says, ‘is the group which pressed around Jesus on the banks of the lake of Tiberias. The aristocracy was represented there by a tax-gatherer, and by the wife of a steward. The rest are fishermen and simple folk. Their ignorance was extreme. They had feeble understandings; they believed in spectres and spirits. Not one element of Hellenic culture had penetrated that first *coenaculum*, even their Jewish instruction was very incomplete, but heart and goodwill abounded. The fine climate of Galilee made the life of these good fishermen a perpetual enchantment. Their life was a true prelude to the kingdom of God; simple, good, happy, rocked gently upon their delightful little sea, or sleeping in the evening on its banks. We do not realise the intoxication of a life which is thus spent in the face of heaven, the strong and gentle flame which this perpetual contact with nature enkindles, the dreams of those nights spent under the light of stars, under an azure dome of depth immeasurable. In the age of Jesus, heaven was not closed, the earth was not frozen. The cloud still opened over the Son of man; angels

ascended and descended over His head ; the visions of the kingdom of God were everywhere, for man carried them in his heart. The soft clear eye of these simple souls contemplated the universe in its ideal source ; perchance the world unveiled its secret to the Divinely lucid consciousness of those happy infants, whose purity of heart merited their one day seeing God.'—Pp. 164, 165.

This one passage gives us the key-note of M. Renan's conception of the rise of Christian life, doctrine, and communion ; and most idyllic are the pictures he draws of Jesus,—the Bridegroom attended by his paranympths, wandering through that Eden of Galilee. A troupe of gay, simple country folk, like bands of children, and of enthusiastic women, with overflowing hearts ; they go from village to village, from fête to fête ; resting on mountain-tops or on the shore of the lake, to hear their adored Teacher ; and sleeping under the shadow of the vines. Such a wild dream does M. Renan venture to paint and present to us, as his conception of the beautiful innocence, the pure and happy dawn, of the kingdom of God on earth. 'All the history of growing Christianity has become thus a delicious pastoral. A Messiah at the marriage-feast, the courtesan and the good Zaccheus called to his feasts, the founders of the kingdom of heaven as a *cortège* of *paranympths* : this is what Galilee has dared to accept, and has made the world accept.' (P. 67.)

In such an *al fresco* mode of life, the luxuries which wealth affords were not to be thought of. This gave rise to the severe doctrine which Jesus now taught respecting riches, and his exaltation of poverty. This asceticism belongs to an exaggeration which henceforth characterized the teaching and pretensions of Jesus,—the lurid fire of fanaticism mingling with the pure light of truth. Yet this exaltation of poverty, which assimilates early Christianity to Ebionism, holds deeply to the old Hebrew spirit ; for 'the thought that God is the avenger of the poor and of the feeble against the rich and powerful is found in every page of the Old Testament ;' and further, it belongs to the very greatness of Jesus. Like all great men, Jesus had a liking for the people, and felt himself at home with them. The Gospel was made, in His thought, for the poor. All whom orthodox Judaism despised He preferred. There were many among His group of followers that surprised the rigorists ; the Pharisees and doctors were scandalised at His intimacy with people of evil repute.

Jesus then made His first attempt on Jerusalem ; and here let us acknowledge, that M. Renan describes with amazing piquancy, and yet with perfect fidelity, the moral situation of Judea at that time. The intrigues of the priesthood, without faith or high

morality; the epicurism of the rich, who were mostly Sadducees; the grave babbling of the schools of the Rabbins; and the ostentatious and formal piety of the Pharisees,—all these are delineated with inimitable force. Entering such an arena, the young enthusiast, with His brilliant dreams of 'the kingdom of heaven,' and His Divine assumption, could not fail to awake the contempt and mocking of the crowds He attracted, so different from the simple-hearted folks of Galilee. The soul of Jesus was wounded and repelled at every step. The profane and vulgar officialism that polluted the temple shocked His religious sentiment. He said they made the house of God a cave of robbers, and even it is reported that one day He scourged the law officers of the temple, and upset their tables. 'The charming Doctor, who pardoned all, provided they loved Him, could not find much response in this sanctuary of vain disputes and antiquated sacrifices.' (P. 219.)

And this one thought Jesus took with him from Jerusalem, which was henceforth deeply rooted in His mind; viz., that there was no possible compromise with the old Jewish worship. 'The abolition of sacrifices which had caused Him so much disgust, the suppression of an impious and haughty priesthood, and in a general sense the abrogation of the law, appeared to Him absolutely necessary. From this moment He is no more a Jewish reformer, He is the destroyer of Judaism.' (P. 221.)

In contrast with the Jews, whom He encountered at Jerusalem, He gave and found willing sympathy with the proselyte Gentiles who were always treated as inferior by the Jews, and with the Samaritans. It was to the Samaritan woman that Jesus said, 'The hour cometh, when men shall worship neither upon this mountain nor at Jerusalem, but when true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth;' of which saying M. Renan remarks, 'The day on which Jesus pronounced that word, He was indeed *Son of God*. He spoke for the first time that word upon which will repose the edifice of the eternal religion. He founded the pure worship, without date or country, which all elevated souls will practise to the end of time.' (P. 234.)

Now, however, begin the difficulties of M. Renan's task. How explain the legends that grew up so early respecting this young Nazarene? How account for His miracles? From the notion that Jesus had of His filial relation with the Father, we have seen how the audacious conception fired His breast, that He was the Messiah, who should found God's kingdom and judge the world. He accepted first the title, 'Son of David,' 'probably without involving Himself in the innocent frauds by which His disciples wished to assure it to Him.' 'His legend' (the legend of His birth) 'was thus the fruit of a great conspiracy,

which was wholly spontaneous, and it elaborated itself around Him during His life. No great event of history has transpired without giving occasion to a cycle of fables; and Jesus could not, if He would, prevent these popular creations. Perhaps a sagacious eye might have discerned even then the germ of the stories which should attribute to Him a supernatural birth, whether because of that notion spread throughout antiquity, that no extraordinary man could be born in the ordinary manner, or because of the chapter of Isaiah, which was misinterpreted, and where they believed it to be written that the Messiah should be born of a virgin, or, finally, because of the notion that the breath [*spiritus*] of God, already erected into a Divine hypostasis, is a principle of fecundity.' (P. 241.) Here is the explanation of the rise of the Christian legend, which does not recite any action of Jesus Himself. Jesus did not dream 'of representing Himself as an incarnation of God Himself.' (P. 242.) But the transcendent idealism of Jesus did 'not permit Him to have a very clear notion of His own personality. He is His Father, His Father is He.' (P. 244.) 'The title of the *Son of Man* expressed His office as judge; that of the *Son of God* expressed His participation in the supreme designs of the world and in the Father's power. His Father has given Him all power.' (P. 243.) The admiration of His followers overwhelmed Him, and carried Him away. It is evident that the title of Rabbi, with which He was content at first, no longer contented Him. The title even of 'Prophet,' or of the 'Sent of God,' did not now answer to His thought. The position which He attributed to Himself was that of a supernatural being, and He wished that He should be regarded as having relations with God more exalted than those of other men. But it must be remarked that 'these words, *superhuman* and *supernatural*, borrowed from our paltry theology, had no meaning to the high religious consciousness of Jesus. For Him, nature and the development of humanity were not kingdoms limited out of God, mean realities subject to the laws of a hopeless empiricism. For Him there was no *supernatural* because there was no *nature*.' (P. 246.)

These exalted pantheistic phrases of Jesus gave birth to the doctrine of 'The Word' in the primitive Church, which was created by the Apostle John and his school, who thus set up a doctrine wholly different from that of 'the kingdom of God.'

It is to justify these high pretensions of Jesus, or these concessions to popular opinion, and to introduce his theory as to the wonder-working to which Jesus lent Himself, that M. Renan favours us at this juncture with his idea of sincerity as a peculiarity of Latin and Teutonic races, and a sure sign of ex-

hausted force. Even previously, in apology for His yielding to baptism by John, he remarks, 'Jesus conceded much to opinion, and adopted many things, simply because they were popular.' (P. 107.) So here more fully he repeats, 'We must not ask logic or consistency in the conduct of Jesus. The need He had to gain for Himself repute and the enthusiasm of His disciples heaped together contradictory notions;' and then he adds, 'With our races, profoundly serious conviction signifies sincerity in one's own conscience; but conscientiousness has not much meaning with Oriental people, little accustomed to the delicacies of critical thought. Good faith and imposture are words which, in our rigorous conscience, are opposed as two irreconcilable terms; but in the East there are a thousand windings and escapes from the one to the other. History is impossible if we do not boldly grant that there are different standards of sincerity. All great things are done by the people; but the people are only led by yielding to their ideas. It is easy for us, impotent as we are, to call that a falsehood, and, proud of our integrity, to treat with disdain the heroes who accepted the conflict of life on other conditions than ourselves. When we shall have accomplished with our scruples what these men have done with their lies, we shall have the right to be severe on them. At least, it is necessary to distinguish profoundly societies like ours, where all passes in the full light of reflection, from naïve and credulous societies, when those faiths have been born that rule the ages. There is here no great foundation laid which does not rest upon a legend. And the only party that is guilty in such a case is the humanity that wishes to be deceived.' (Pp. 252-254)

This exposition of morality fitly introduces M. Renan's explanation of the working of miracles by Jesus. Miracles were recognised in that age as the indispensable mark of the Divine, and the sign of the prophetic vocation. It was believed that the Messiah would work many. Antiquity, save the great scientific schools of Greece, allowed the miraculous; and Jesus, who had no superior knowledge upon such matters to His contemporaries, had not the least idea of a natural order regulated by laws. Then it was one of his profoundest thoughts that, with faith and prayer, man has all power over nature. A thaumaturge in our days is odious; for he does miracles without believing in them; he is a charlatan. But 'the founders of Christianity felt it to be quite natural that their Master held interviews with Moses and Elias, that He commanded the elements, that He healed the sick.' (P. 258.) Further: 'The popular rumour doubtless exaggerated enormously, both before and after the death of Jesus, the number of facts of this sort;' which,

after all, had not much variety. They are framed upon very few models, accommodated to the taste of the country. It is impossible now to distinguish the miracles which have been falsely attributed to Jesus from those in which He consented to act a principal part. 'Almost all the miracles which Jesus thought of performing appear to have been miracles of healing. Now medicine was then, as now, in Judea by no means scientific, but a matter of individual inspiration; and in such circumstances the presence of a superior man, treating the invalid with gentleness, and giving him by certain sensible signs the assurance of his recovery, is often a decisive remedy.' Here is the whole explanation of the miraculous works of Jesus. 'To heal was thought a moral thing, and Jesus, who felt His moral force, must have felt Himself gifted to heal. But many circumstances appear to indicate that Jesus only became a thaumaturge late in His ministry, and against His will. The miracle is ordinarily the creation of the people rather than of him to whom it is attributed. And so the miracles of Jesus were a violence which His age put on Him, a concession which a temporary necessity forced from Him. Now the Exorcist and Thaumaturge have fallen, but the Religious Reformer will live eternally.' (Pp. 264, 268.)

Eighteen months were spent in Galilee after His first visit to Jerusalem, during which time the first conceptions of Jesus developed in power and audacity. These centred in His doctrine of 'the kingdom of God;' which combined both the Apocalyptic idea of a speedy dissolution of the present world, and its judgment by the Son of Man; and, strange incoherence! a moral system which is to work out a gradual renovation of existing societies; and so M. Renan says, 'Beside the false, cold, impossible idea of a coming pageant, He has conceived the real city of God, the true *palingénésie*, the sermon upon the mount, the apotheosis of the feeble, the love of the people, the liking for the poor, the "*rehabilitation*" of all that is humble, true, and natural.' Jesus chose out twelve of His disciples, to whom He more fully explained His doctrine and intrusted it for publication to the world. They preached and worked miracles during His life; but never at a distance from Him. In this little community the germ of the Church began to appear. 'This fruitful notion of the power of men united (*ecclesia*) appears to belong to Jesus.' (P. 296.) 'To this Church Jesus intrusted remission of sins, &c., though probably many of these phrases have been attributed to the Master in order to give a basis for the collective authority by which the Church sought, at a later period, to replace His own.' (P. 296.) But in the commission of the Church there is no trace of any legislative

code, save upon marriage, or of theological symbol, save some indeterminate views upon the Father, Son, and Spirit; and there was no religious rite. Jesus was accustomed, when at the table with His disciples, to speak of Himself as the true bread. His flesh was their bread, His blood their drink, phrases which signified that He was their nourishment; and apparently He was accustomed, in those happy seasons of free and intimate intercourse, to say, when He broke the bread, 'This is My body.' He doubtless did so at the last supper feast, and so after His death His followers wished to regard the consecration of bread and wine as a *mémorial d'adieu*, which Jesus had left to His disciples in quitting life; and it thus became the great symbol of Christian communion. This was the origin of the eucharist.

Towards the close of His ministry, the exaltation of the spirit, and the asceticism of the doctrine, of Jesus became excessive and awful. We see the beautiful moralist of the first period changed into the 'sombre giant,' who would crush down all opposition. He preached a vigorous warfare against nature,—a complete rupture of the ties of blood. Despising the sacred bonds of nature and of man, He wished that men should only live for Him—should only love Him. 'Something unearthly and strange mixed itself then with His words; it was as a fire devouring life at its root, and reducing all to a frightful desert. This fierce and mournful sentiment of disgust for the world, of excessive abnegation, which characterizes *la perfection Chrétienne*,* had for its originator not the fine and joyous moralist of the early days, but the sombre giant whom a sort of presentiment threw more and more out of humanity.' Passing all bounds, he dared to say, 'If any one will be My disciple, let him renounce himself and follow Me. He who loves his father and mother more than Me is not worthy of Me,' &c. (P. 313.) Here the monachal principle is laid down; in a sense the monk is the only true Christian. (P. 315.) 'It may be seen that henceforth Jesus lived wholly beyond nature; family, friendship, country, had no more any meaning for Him; all that was not the kingdom of God has absolutely disappeared. Without doubt from that time He had made the sacrifice of His life. At times His death appears to Him to be the means of founding His kingdom, and again as a sacrifice to appease His Father and to save men. And now He had terrible agonies and convulsions. His enemies thought Him possessed. His disciples even had a kind of fear before Him, and His evil humour sometimes drove Him, against all resistance, to acts that were inexplicable and apparently absurd.' (P. 319.)

* In the Romaniist sense.

We do not need to recite the close of this life. The struggles of Jesus with orthodox Judaism represented by the Pharisees, and with the official hypocrisy of all parties, were continuous, and so embittered that only death could end them. These disputes and hostilities waxed hotter from the time of the last visit to Jerusalem. The death of Jesus was resolved upon, and means taken to bring it about. The whole of the *dénouement* of that drama in Jerusalem is described with the most vivid realisation of the scene and its actors. The hate of the priesthood, the guile with which their plot is carried out, the scene of the Sanhedrim, the Roman tribunal,—are all depicted with rare talent. Pilate is perfectly comprehended, 'his indifference, his hesitation, his scruples, his cowardly surrender to the passions of the crowd, when he was made to fear a dangerous report to Rome concerning his conduct.' All that anatomy of a prefect, of a functionary of the Roman empire, is given with the highest psychological skill.*

And also *the passion* is depicted with woeful pathos. All but the meaning of that death is there. The accessories are draped in their gloomy horror; but M. Renan comprehends not the dying victim whose death is life to man. With His last breath the life of Jesus ends. 'But such was the impression which He had left on the heart of His disciples, and of some devoted females, that during many weeks He was for them still living, and a comforter. Had His body been removed, or did enthusiasm, always credulous, give birth afterwards to the *ensemble* of narratives, by which it was sought to establish faith in the resurrection? This we shall never know, because of contradictory documents. Let us say, however, that the strong imagination of Mary Magdalene played a leading part in that matter. Power divine of love! Sacred moments, when the passion of a deluded woman gives to the world a God raised to life!' (P. 434.)

We have thus sketched and epitomised the *Vie de Jésus* for our readers: we have endeavoured to show the natural development of the writer's plan and ideas, and have studiously avoided any exaggeration that might ridicule his hypothesis. Our readers have, we believe, a fair and complete view of the explanation which M. Renan, a scholar so learned, so reverent, and so skilled in the fine inductions of historical science, gives of the life of Jesus, so far as it can be recovered from histories that are largely legendary, and of the origin of Christianity;—in which he explains the entire phenomenon by natural causes. Granting his fundamental principle, which he reiterates

* E. de Pressensé, *L'Ecole Critique et Jésus*, xi., p. 27.

as the foundation of all science, and therefore of criticism and true history,—that a miracle is necessarily false; we frankly avow, that we do know how a more gracious and plausible hypothesis could be framed for explaining by natural law the *facts* that are to be solved,—the existence of the Gospel records, and the stupendous renovation of society which began with the words of Jesus, and advances, with mightier force to-day than ever, to its completion. But how pitifully paltry and insufficient is this hypothesis! How miraculously incoherent and impossible! How gross its outrages upon reason and true science which it professes to save by abjuring miracles! We admit that man has here done the most that learning, genius, and exquisite tact, could have done, or are likely to do, to vindicate a natural and human origin for the Revelation of Jesus Christ: but the loftiness and splendour of the attempt but reveal the more strikingly that he attempts the impossible, and prove the more exhaustively that a cause infinitely transcending nature is necessary to account for this phenomenon. We repeat that this book is a new and rich contribution to Christian Apologetics. But to our criticism.

II. We desire briefly, but closely, to examine and refute the groundless axiom which is yet the ground of this book, and of all modern infidelity,—that every record of a miracle is false.

Our reader, who refers to the note at page 467, will see how this principle avowedly lies at the basis of all M. Renan's methods of criticism; and he will have seen, from the sketch of his work, that it determines absolutely every judgment of M. Renan. Supernatural revelation or intervention is impossible. This conception of Christianity is a delusion: therefore Christianity must have come, and therefore, again, it has come, from a merely human source; and, by the same argument, every conception of the life of Jesus, imputing superhuman perfection to His character, or miraculous power to His will, must be false; and therefore, again, the narratives of His life which we possess must be interpreted so as to bring back to us His real character and work, and to account for the origin of these supernatural contents which are repudiated. We close at once, then, with the axiom of modern science,—as M. Renan so truly styles it,—which is the foundation of his work; and desire our readers to give their earnest study to these considerations.

(I.) *The nature of a miracle.*

The nature of a miracle is now more accurately apprehended than formerly, as the meaning of 'Natural Law' has been more exactly defined and understood. It would be impossible now to adopt Spinoza's definition of a miracle, which he explains to

be 'a rare event, happening according to some laws that are unknown to us.' Science has exploded the conception of laws in the domain of nature which is implied here. They are not latent self-willed powers, that yet lurk in the universe, ready for a sudden and marvellous display. Even if they were, any man would be justly endowed with authority over his fellow man, who held these secret and capricious laws or forces of nature submissive to his bidding. But this conception of natural law is utterly erroneous. The operation of any force or property in nature nowise depends upon the discovery of the law of its operation. Gravitation was at work, and people knew that apples fell when ripe, before the subtle mind of Newton detected the method of its influence, and formulated its law. Laws are not inoperative because unknown; and people know the familiar results of their activity, though the modes of their activity be hidden. Further: in every moment, and at every point of the world, the properties of every substance subsisting there, are *necessarily* manifested according to the relations they hold to one another; for if not, if any substance does not act according to its nature, it is no longer itself; it is something else. It is an absurdity, which is even inconceivable, because it is a logical contradiction, to think of an unknown physical law suddenly revealing itself in certain familiar circumstances. All physical laws, *i. e.*, the properties of all physical objects, *always* reveal themselves, and are identically the same in given relations. A new material agent may manifest its presence, or new relations may elicit new and wonderful because formerly unknown properties in familiar substances. But when both of these suppositions are excluded, and the relations of common objects of life are precisely such as occur every hour in the experience of all men, it is preposterous to imagine an unknown law of nature manifesting itself once and no more. So that the answer of Science is twofold to this chimera of Spinoza. (1.) Though the laws of nature are in full unremitted play, revealing themselves in the ever varying correlations of persons and substances, and have been since the present order of nature was established; yet no facts, like the miracles attested in the Gospels, have ever been repeated elsewhere: a clear proof that they did not happen according to natural law. (2.) The circumstances or physical relations in which these miracles were done, were patent, and are constantly renewed in life, so that the same result would follow, on every such occasion, if any natural law, *though unknown*, were its cause, just as the ripe apple always falls from the tree, and the flung stone sweeps its parabola to the earth, by the force of gravitation,

whether people know it to result from that force or not. The miracle, accordingly, is now clearly distinguished from a merely marvellous or extraordinary phenomenon.

There is no question at present as to the reality, but only as to the nature, of miracles; and as this is a fundamental point not sufficiently recognised, we shall briefly elaborate it. In the foregoing paragraph we have used the word 'law' in its general acceptation, which, though quite correct, is, as in the case of other complex and abstract words, exceedingly vague. Now, to be exact, we understand natural law to denote two things:—

1. The *mode* and *measure* of the activity of the different properties of physical substances, organic or inorganic, in their correlation with each other. According to nature, *i. e.*, the specific nature of each individual substance, these properties are invariably the same. If they be changed, it is a creative act,—a miracle, and *supernatural*. Accordingly, wherever the same relation is renewed, the same properties are exhibited; and, further, the mode and measure of their activity are absolutely identical.*

2. The physical order, self-balancing and self-sustaining, of the universe, produced by the wise adjustment of the separate substances in the universe, whose proper activities, regulated by the relations in which they stand, are the causes of this general order.† But this order is established and (according to its nature) invariable; for all variations, in subordinate spheres, are restrained within invariable limits, and so form part of a grand scheme of perfect order. We shall omit, for brevity's sake, further reference to this second meaning of natural law; and, confining ourselves to the first, we affirm that if, *in precisely the same* relations of certain physical agents, the usual effects do not follow, or new effects are superadded, then a *miraculous* event has occurred. The properties of a new substance, or the new properties of any substance elicited by new relations in which it has been unexpectedly placed, may be *marvellous* and surprising; but when the same physical agents hold identically the same relation or connexion with each other, as fire with water, or a living man with a confined corpse, and an effect happens differing from the usual experienced results, then a miracle has taken place: because all the laws—*i. e.*, all the properties belonging to this material agent—

* Austin's *Province of Jurisprudence determined*: 'When a fact frequently observed recurs invariably under the same circumstances, we compare it to an act which has been prescribed, and say it recurs according to law.'

† See Dr. McCosh's profound exposition of Natural Law, from p. 75 to p. 158 of his *Divine Government*.

are acting always with precise, invariable intensity, and, necessarily, according to their nature; and if, whenever brought into such relations, the usual effect does not follow, their laws (it is plain) are suspended—their properties have been altered. It is true this new effect has a cause, for we cannot conceive of any change without a cause: but the cause is *super-natural*—i. e., it is a cause so above nature, that it has power to control the properties that have been imparted by the Creator to the objects of nature, and to impart others. We grant that the most scrupulous investigation must be made, in any case of alleged miracle, to see that this new effect be not produced by some unnoticed physical agent, whose presence, in combination with the other co-ordinate causes, has occasioned this novel result by their common action. But this being settled, —the alleged case putting this possibility out of the question, —then the universal activity of the properties of matter being arrested or changed, the invariable (according to nature) law of their co-operation being violated, a miracle has taken place.

We have excluded the consideration of human agency, not to complicate our argument; but the argument applies in exactly the same manner. For there is a natural law limiting human agency, in all its variations, as nearly ascertained as the invariable laws of material substances. If, then, the Lord Christ convert five loaves into a sufficiency for five thousand persons; if, when He speaks, the blind see, the lepers are cleansed, the dead live; all the physical agents concerned being named, and their actual properties well known; further, the relations between Him and the bread and the bodies of men being patent, and capable of renewal by any man at any time; the event is no marvel, but a miracle.

(II.) *Science has no power to discredit miracles.*

Science discovers and methodizes those laws of which a miracle, by its essential nature, is alleged to be a suspension. Whether, then, science discredits miracles or not, depends on the antecedent question—whether or not science has power to show these laws of nature to be inviolable, even by God. There are two lines of thought which we shall rapidly traverse.

1. We have explicitly acknowledged that, under the present constitution of nature, there is a constant uniformity in the connexion of physical causes and effects; which means that each physical agent, organic or inorganic, acts invariably according to its own *nature* in every relation it holds. It is this confession that alone enables us to understand the meaning of a miracle, or to apprehend its evidence, as the proof of Divine power in denaturing any substance or being of its own properties, which were given by Him, and altering the order

Himself had fixed. But it is experience alone—*i. e.*, our own perceptions and the *testimony* of mankind—which acquaints us with the precise character of natural laws; and the same experience—*i. e.*, our own perceptions or valid testimony—*may* acquaint us with a change, temporary or permanent, of the nature of any object, and a consequent violation in the order of universal nature. It is impossible, accordingly, to pronounce these laws inviolable, so long as the testimony exists as good as that which avouches their usual uniformity, to avouch the exceptional suspensions, as in creative acts and in Christian miracles; so that, when Hume and these positive philosophers say a miracle is contrary to experience, we simply reply, They have not made a complete induction of human experience; and that *it is not contrary* to, but established by, that experience, and corroborated by the existing monuments of creation.

The position of these philosophers is, that the physical nature of each substance and being, and consequently the physical order of the universe, is eternal—has never been, will not be, and can never be changed. This position they maintain on four grounds. (A) General experience, which is but that testimony which they elsewhere vilify. (B) Their frequent assertion 'that the grand truth of the universal order and constancy of natural causes is a primary belief.' The ground is here shifted. Experience cannot sustain such a proposition as this, which transcends all limits of human existence and knowledge; so it is asserted to be a primary belief: but sound philosophy has not endorsed, and will not endorse, this opinion. (C) The erroneous impression that a miracle impugns 'the ultimate idea of universal causation;' in confutation of which charge we shall simply quote the decisive language of Stuart Mill:—'In order that any alleged fact should be contradictory to a law of causation, the allegation must be, not simply that the cause existed without being followed by the effect, for that would be no uncommon occurrence; but that this happened in the absence of any adequate counteracting cause. Now, in the case of an alleged miracle, the assertion is the exact opposite of this.*' (D) The assumption that each physical event must be referable to physical causes. 'The foundation conception of universal law, is to recognise the impossibility of any modification whatsoever of material agents, unless through the invariable operation of a series of eternally impressed consequences following in the chain of orderly connexion.'

* *Logic*, vol. ii., p. 186.

This denies the action of all spiritual force whatsoever upon the physical world; but man's consciousness and experience assure him of the reality of his voluntary powers to modify the existing condition of material agents. It is true that he cannot alter their properties—he can only change their relations, so that their various properties may be variously manifest; but he does modify their existing conditions, by changing their relative position, and thus eliciting the different modes of their activity. Yet man is a spiritual cause, and his action is not the result of a series of eternally impressed consequences *in him*, and *it does interfere* with such a series, in its operation, *out of him*, on the material agents he modifies. And this spiritual causal energy of man shadows the spiritual creative power of God; for the question at issue means:—Is the nature of each substance, organized and inorganized, eternal? Is it self-existent? If not, who has created it? God. And the Power which gave that specific nature, *i.e.*, its totality of properties, to every substance, has power to suspend, change, or annul it. We simply indicate the conclusions to which this modern doctrine inexorably leads,—that there is no creation; that the development and physical order of all things is eternal; that if God exist, He dwells aloof from this universe, which was neither created by Him nor can be affected by Him; that man was not created by God, nor can be assisted by God; and that as man is a mere development,—a link in a series of eternally impressed consequences,—his dream of immortality is the bauble of the childish fancy, which breaks at the philosopher's touch.

2. The subordination of facts to laws is insisted upon, in a manner which shows an entire misconception of the nature of physical facts or of physical laws. Laws are only generalised facts. All that a true inquirer can do, is accurately to know the facts, and to learn from them their laws. He dares not fashion or subordinate them to preconceived laws. In M. Prevost's language,* '*Une loi est un rapport, ou mieux, un rapport ou rapports, une proportion. C'est une généralisation, une loi ne peut agir.*' Montesquieu says, 'Laws, in their most extended signification, are the necessary relations arising from the nature of things.'† To the same purpose Dr. Reid,—'The laws of nature are the rules according to which effects are produced.' We have propounded our own views in the former section. These testimonies are adduced to show that physical laws are but the general statements of the modes

* Sir William Hamilton's edition of Dugald Stewart, vol. iii., Appendix, art. 11.

† *Spirit of Laws*, book i., chap. i.

in which physical facts occur, and are wholly subordinated to the facts,—not the facts to them.

If it were simply meant that all facts, natural or miraculous, occurring in this universe, must be acquitted of the charge of a lawless and meaningless caprice, and must have taken place in accordance with the prevision and predetermined plan of the great Lawgiver, we would of course cordially agree with this doctrine. In this sense we maintain that miracles, the temporary suspension of physical laws, themselves only of temporary duration, must be conceived to be accomplished by the will of God, and consequently subordinate to His supreme law. We have found worthy language in a contemporary to express this thought, and to conclude this section :—

‘To the assumption that God always acts according to law, in other words, that the infinite perfection of His nature excludes the idea of all caprice, uncertainty, and contradiction in His modes of action, we can take no exception. But it does not follow that the laws already within our intellectual ken, must embrace all possible laws. There are, probably, laws within laws, only unfolded by degrees to human view,—stratifications, as it were, of spiritual agency,—one underlying the other; the deepest and widest of which only *crop out* now and then on the outer surface of human affairs. To deny this, seems to us to be a narrow dogmatism, which presumes to arrest at a certain point the development of man’s acquaintance with the ways of God, and ties up, by a limited experience, the possibilities of future knowledge.’ According to this view, a miracle may be defined *an intersection of a lower course of Nature by the higher course of Nature.*

(III.) *The power of testimony to accredit miracles.*

It is gratifying to hear the confessions made by all the leaders of the antichristian party, with respect to Hume’s celebrated argument against miracles. Hume paraded it as invincible; it is now discarded as worthless. Hume affirms, ‘A miracle is a violation of the laws of nature; and as a firm and unalterable experience has established these laws, the proof against a miracle, from the very nature of the fact, is as entire as any argument from experience can possibly be imagined.’* The pith of his entire essay is concentrated in that terse sentence of Paley, ‘It is contrary to experience that a miracle should be true, but not contrary to experience that testimony should be false.’† When it is recollected that ‘experience’ in these sentences must mean ‘testimony,’ the flagrant *petitio principii* of this famous argument is patent. If a miracle be contrary

* Hume’s *Essays*, vol. ii., Essay 10, p. 133. † *Works*, vol. iii.; *Evidences*, p. 4.

to all testimony, of course it is not true. But what, if it be not contrary to experience—if it be supported by irrefragable testimony? This glaring fallacy accordingly is abandoned by the ablest opponents of Christianity. Stuart Mill's language is explicit:—'Hume's celebrated principle, that nothing is credible which is contradictory to experience, or at variance with the laws of nature, is merely this very plain and harmless proposition,—that *whatever is contrary to a complete induction is incredible*. Does not (it may be asked) the very statement of the proposition imply a contradiction? An alleged fact, according to this theory, is not to be believed if it contradicts a complete induction. But it is essential to the completeness of an induction that it shall not contradict any known fact. Is it not, then, a *petitio principii* to say, that the fact ought to be disbelieved because the induction opposed to it is complete? How can we have a right to declare the induction complete, while facts, supported by credible evidence, present themselves against it?'* The former part of this sentence is also quoted with approbation by G. H. Lewes;† so that we may presume, since Hume's followers flout the fallacy of his essay, it will henceforth rest among the 'forgotten dead.' Nevertheless, we may not forget by whose arms that once valiant foe has fallen. Weapons to overthrow Hume were doubtless at hand in his own arsenal. His concession, in the after-part of his essay, that 'there may possibly be miracles, or violations of the usual course of nature, of such a kind as to admit of proof from human testimony,'‡ and his asseveration, in his essay on 'Liberty and Necessity,' that human motives have the same necessity as human causes, were suicidal to his boastful argument. But Christian scholars could not use the latter assertion of Hume to rebut his equally groundless assertions concerning miracles, save by exposing their mutual contradictions. They have reasoned fairly against his theory. Its two antithetic divisions have been separately controverted. Dr. Chalmers has assailed the proposition, that 'it is not contrary to experience that testimony should be false;' and shown that our experience discriminates between different sorts of testimony. There is a kind of testimony, distinguished by appropriate marks, which a uniform and unalterable experience has proved to be true; and for such testimony to be false, would be as miraculous, because as contrary to human experience, as any other recorded miracle. 'We should distinguish,' he writes, 'between one mode of testimony and another; the one bearing those distinct

* *Logic*, vol. ii., pp. 184, 185.

† See *History of Philosophy*, vol. ii., p. 45.

‡ *Essays*, vol. ii., p. 150.

and specific marks which we have experienced to be indicative of truth; the other bearing its own peculiar and distinctive marks also, which are specifically diverse from the former, and which we have experienced to be indicative of falsehood. The same experience which besets a diffidence in the latter testimony, besets a confidence in the former; and we see in this department the working of the same uniform principle which obtains in all other departments of causation.*

Dr. Wardlaw has the honour of exposing the covert fallacy and monstrous presumption of the balancing proposition in Hume's essay, that 'it is contrary to experience that a miracle should be true.' To the hot fire of his heavy cannonade we owe the eager abandonment of Hume's position by his partisans. Right boldly does the clear-eyed logician advance to his task. He exclaims, 'I may be deemed presumptuous, but I must speak as I think. Hume's argument has ever appeared to me a piece of the sheerest and most puerile and pitiful sophistry, that ever had the sanction of a philosopher's name.' And if our readers wish to see this glittering sophism ground to powder and scattered to the winds, we recommend them to read Dr. Wardlaw's work on Miracles, or the more condensed pages of his *Systematic Theology*.† The following is the conclusion of his relentless logic, in which we discover the original of Mr. Stuart Mill's protest against Hume: 'How is it that the uniformity of the laws of nature, and of the order of the material universe, is ascertained? It is, according to this philosopher, by an unvarying experience. Well, but how is it that this unvarying experience is ascertained? It cannot be in any other way than by testimony. See, then, to what we are thus brought; for, in the first place, as we have seen, Mr. Hume's uniform experience resolves itself into uniform testimony; and his assertion of the uniformity is contrary to fact, inasmuch as the testimony, or, in other words, the recorded experience, is not uniform, there being testimony, or recorded experience, for the deviations from the laws of nature, as well as for their uniformity. And, what is more, secondly, Mr. Hume's own belief in the uniformity of the laws, or course of nature, rests, after all, on the very same description of evidence which he rejects when it comes in support of alleged deviations from that uniformity. He disowns everything miraculous, on the ground that nature is uniform, and human testimony fallacious. Yet it is only by this same fallacious testimony that his faith in the uniformity of nature is determined. The evidence of the ground on which he rejects miracles is the

* *Works*, vol. iii., b. i., c. iii., sec. 1, pp. 88, 89.
VOL. XXI. NO. XLII.

† *Works*, vol. i., pp. 265-285.

same in kind, as it then turns out, with the evidence on which others believe them.'*

The competence of testimony to avouch a fact at variance with natural law, as well as in accordance with it, being thus unanimously allowed, the controversy is thus confined to the single question, whether the particular testimony adduced in evidence of Christian miracles is sufficient and trustworthy.

It is, however, objected that no testimony can reach to the supernatural: 'testimony can apply only to apparent sensible facts; testimony can only prove an extraordinary and perhaps inexplicable occurrence or phenomenon: that it is due to supernatural causes, is entirely dependent on the previous belief and assumption of the parties.' Now, if it be maintained that testimony does apply to, and is sufficient to prove, 'apparent sensible facts,' this is all that is asked. No one has ever supposed that it belonged to the witnesses of a miracle to decide as to its cause. The miracle is an apparent sensible fact, and it is simply this fact they attest. We believe that we are not only as competent, but even more competent than the witnesses of these miracles, to judge their divinity. Science has elucidated the meaning and limits of natural law, so that it is counted absurd now to ascribe the miracles of Christianity to 'magic,' as Celsus and Porphyry did. And the harmony of the Cosmos, which reveals one mind as its Creator, has abolished the Eastern hierarchy of intermediary beings, who shared in the work of creation, and were accordingly credited with the power of working miracles. Modern philosophy has demonstrated that the God who *created* the properties of matter, alone could destroy and change them; so that while the verdict of every sane mind, in any age, would always be that of Nicodemus,—'No man can do these miracles which Thou doest, except God be with him,'†—we affirm that, granting the historic reality of these miracles, the evidence of this Divine cause is more direct and resistless to us than to men of a preceding age. What shall we say to the averment, that 'by science and by reason we neither have, nor can possibly have, any evidence of a Deity working miracles?'‡ We maintain the full contrary. Unequivocal testimony may evidence the miracle, but we can proceed no further. This evidence does not vouch for the conjectured cause. But reason does, by its fundamental intuition, announce that the miracle *has* a sufficient cause. A miracle is described to be a suspension or violation of the law of nature. Accordingly, the power which caused the miracle is one sufficient to arrest and change the

* Wardlaw's *Systematic Theology*, vol. i., pp. 273, 274.

† *Essays and Reviews*, p. 142.

‡ John iii. 2.

action of the universe; and reason, by a thousand different proofs, asserts this power to be God's alone. So that we close at once with our opponents on their own admission; let the sensible part of the miracle be allowed, and our reason, apart from all other testimony, will prove that the *Deity has wrought it*.

(IV.) The deep ground of the controversy between the modern opponents of miracles and Christian advocates, lies in the contrast between the natural and the moral world, and this is gradually being revealed; so that the settlement of the controversy is acknowledged to depend upon the premises assumed, as to the constitution of the universe, and the nature of God. Though our space is limited, we note briefly the different '*momenta*' involved in this higher controversy.

1. The natural philosophers who have become the modern champions of Rationalism, regard physical order, with its 'eternally impressed series' of consequences, as the supreme end and fundamental principle of the universe. The physical government of the universe absorbs their thoughts, and every consideration of humanity and of spiritual life is blotted out of their mind. Man is reduced to a mere additional wheel or lever in the vast apparatus of physical force, which forms the cosmos; and all human interests are regarded as perfectly subordinate to its inexorable process. It is according to this view of the universe, that Baden Powell informs us, 'The foundation conception of the universe is that of physical law.'* If it be admitted that man is free, his freedom is a sorrowful endowment, as he is hopelessly imprisoned in the centre of forces which grind on their determined course relentlessly; and not even God is imagined to be able or willing to alter or arrest these forces for his advantage in the most imminent danger. The Christian believer, on the other hand, and not in reference to his faith in miracles, but as the paramount truth of his religion, holds that the moral government of God is supreme, and that the physical order of the universe is wholly subordinate to it; that man has not been made to ornament and crown nature, but that all nature has been constituted and is sustained for his sake; and that everywhere physical laws are established for the spiritual good of mankind, and that in conformity with this regulative cause they may be and, if necessary, will be altered. Spirit is greater than

* Compare with these views of the natural philosophers Sir William Hamilton's second lecture on Metaphysics; where he shows 'that the phenomena of matter, taken by themselves, (you will observe the qualification 'taken by themselves,') 'so far from warranting any inference to the existence of a God, would, on the contrary, ground even an argument to His negation; but that the study of the external world, taken with and in subordination to that of the internal, not only loses its atheistic tendency, but under such subservience may be rendered conducive to this conclusion, from which if left to itself it would dissuade us.'

matter; therefore the Christian believer conceives that for the redemption of the human spirit the laws of matter may be suspended; and that if this possibility be not allowed, it convicts God of a terrible impotency, and the order of His universe, considered in its highest aspects, as a 'moral order' of a ruinous imperfection.*

2. Underneath all rationalistic arguments against a supernatural revelation from God, there is assumed an idea of God, which, not only the instinctive sentiments of our heart, but the highest philosophy of the old world and of Christendom repudiates with scorn. It has been observed that this idea of God is identical in the Eastern religions of Buddhism and Brahminism, and in the various German schemes of pantheism; and that, further, it leads to the same practical results as the atheistic positivism of Comte and Lewes, which acknowledge nothing but physical or necessary law. But the root of this strange identity has not been traced and laid bare. It is this, the conception of God as a mere intelligence—a pure mind. That this is the essential idea, both of Brahminism and of Buddhism, has been clearly apprehended and expressed by the Rev. Frederick D. Maurice, in his Boyle Lecture, *The Religions of the World*. He speaks there of Brahminism: 'The learned man, the contemplative sage, aspires to be one with whom he adores, to lose his own being in this. And what is this Being? He is the absolute intelligence, the essential light. But contemplation then is His glory, His perfection. The God is an intelligence, not a will; Himself, a higher priest, a more glorious student, a more perfect contemplator. You can scarcely conceive a mandate from such a Being; all things must flow from Him, as light from the sun, or thought from a musing man. Such an idea is ever implied in Hinduism.' (P. 40.) And again Mr. Maurice thus describes Buddhism: 'Buddha is clear light, perfect wisdom; you must not try to conceive of him as doing anything, that is not so much his attribute as his very essence. Beginning with the notion that the intelligence is entirely separated from the world, that he is one and yet multiform, the Buddhist may arrive by a series of easy steps at a conclusion, which would seem almost opposed to this, that the intelligence is essentially one with the world; in fact, that it can only be considered as the informing life or soul of the world.'

In like manner, every pantheistic philosophy originates in

* We cannot resist the temptation to quote here a very profound and beautiful sentence occurring in Dr. Harris's last work:—'The first errors of Hume and his followers lay in confounding that inner circle, called the course of nature, with that larger outer circle, the course of Providence; which preceded nature and encompasses it, which originated it, employs it, and at distant intervals adds to it or modifies it at pleasure.'—*Patriarchy*, p. 182.

the same fallacious conception of the Divine nature, whether the Deity be the infinite *subject*, as with Fichte, or the infinite *mind*, as with Schelling, or, as with Hegel, 'a perpetual process—an eternal thinking, without beginning and end,'—the absolute idea, developing and externalising itself and returning to itself again. We have in all these philosophies, Oriental and German, an intellectual concept, magnified and exalted into the Deity; and then the manifestation of this Deity, the order of His universe, is supposed to follow the law of intellectual processes, which, apart from the will, are as necessarily connected as the relations of cause and effect in the realms of nature. The results of this erroneous assumption are inevitable: in the first place, the personality of the Deity is denied, because from the intellect alone that idea is not derived. It comes from the will, the essential principle of our nature; and 'will' being denied to God, the conception of His personality as of His freedom becomes impossible; accordingly, the bounds of His personality being lost, He becomes confessedly one and the same with the universe, as the pantheist affirms. In the second place, the processes of God's physical and moral government being thus conceived as the movements of pure reason, an absolute necessity attaches to them. Freedom, the power of change, lies in the will; apart from our will, the train of mental associations would be an eternal series of consequences. In like manner, if the laws of God's universe be judged as the manifestations of that Divine reason, and the reason be determined simply by the laws of reason, as we discern them in ourselves, then they are unalterable; the process is as mechanical as the chain of physical causation, and hence the practical conclusions of the pantheist and the positivist are identical. But Christianity has not revealed such a God, our heart rebels against the monstrosity; the philosophies of Plato and Aristotle avoided the error of apotheosizing human reason, separate from the other elements of our nature, in conjunction with which alone the existence of reason is even conceivable. And Sir William Hamilton has condensed the last result of modern philosophy in that famous sentence which carries inevitable destruction to every shade of pantheism, and all rationalism,—'Though man be not identical with the Deity, still he is created in the image of God. It is indeed only through an analogy of the human with the Divine nature, that we are *perceptant* and *recipient* of this Divinity.* In application of which sentence, he asserts most truly, 'With the proof of the moral nature of man stands or falls the proof of the existence of a God.'†

3. It is forgotten by the rationalistic philosophers, that

* *Discussions*, p. 19.

† Hamilton's *Lectures*, vol. i., p. 33.

spiritual action upon matter is our earliest, most familiar, most constant and certain experience. It is no mere theory, that a free spirit can interfere with the necessary succession of physical causes; it is a universal fact. It betrays a foolhardy recklessness, when a man of Mr. Powell's repute hazards such a statement as the following:—'That all highly cultivated minds have learned to recognise the impossibility even of two material atoms subsisting together without a determinate relation; or of any action of the one on the other, whether of equilibrium or of motion, without reference to a *physical cause*.' This either is dead materialism, the will of man being a physical cause, or it is a piece of empiric prejudice, such as we have never seen surpassed. The natural philosopher, 'exhibiting merely the phenomena of matter and extension, has so habituated himself only to the contemplation of an order, in which everything is determined by the laws of a blind or mechanical necessity,' that he absolutely forgets the motion of his own hand in writing, or legs in walking. Has not the human spirit power to alter the relation of one material substance to another, so as to make one act on the other? To bring this truth into the clearest light, we affirm that, *if physical law be the only law in the universe*, and it alone be the law meant in the definition of a miracle, which makes it 'the suspension of the laws of nature;' then every man who holds a stone in his hand performs a miracle. By a spiritual energy, which indeed is the only source of our idea of power, he does interfere with the law of gravitation. A counter force which is spiritual, does control, resist, and annul the force of gravity. Let it not be said that the leverage of the arm is a physical cause. We admit it; but what force moves the lever? This spiritual action of man upon matter, by which his free will does vary the monotonous and eternally impressed series of physical consequences, is narrowly limited. It has only power, outside of the body, in altering the space-relation of external objects, it cannot change their intrinsic nature; but though wisely limited, it does witness for the control of spirit over matter, and thus shadows forth, while it enables us in some sense to comprehend, the action of the Divine Spirit, who, in the exercise of His holy freedom, has power to control and to change all relations and properties of matter, and adapt them to the sublime moral ends of His government.

4. But another objection is taken *à priori* to miracles. God, it is said, is too wise to need to modify His laws. It is only an unskilful workman who needs to retouch and improve his work. To accuse God of such a proceeding is to insult His majesty; to limit His wisdom; to decry His prescience and His power. Ernest Naville, in an eloquent but profound little

work,* just published, thus deals with this objection, in a manner which leaves nothing more to be desired; and though his reasoning urges one or two considerations which have been already introduced, our readers will thank us for the translation we now give them.

'This objection rests upon a confusion between *material* and *spiritual* order. It would be well grounded if it were a question of stars. It is not well founded when we deal with the moral world. When we speak of a workman and of his work, we have in our mind inert bodies, such as wood, stone, or metal, which once fashioned remain what they are, without reacting upon the action which has formed them. But the question which we are discussing does not concern wood or stone, but a work which has the power of modifying itself. Do you allow that there is a principle of liberty in spiritual creatures? Do you believe that we are responsible for our actions, and that we can do wrong? Who will dare to say, No? But God is holy, He wishes the good—the absolute good. Evil is the contrary of His will. If we commit one bad action, speak one profane word, conceive one impure thought; that action, word, and thought, mount to heaven as a defiance, and say to the holy Being, Thy will is not done. No, it is not done, and He is all powerful. Ah! it is this creature of liberty which is the miracle of miracles.† It is sin which is at once the most splendid manifestation of the power of the Being capable of creating liberty, and the strangest limitation of the power of that Holy Being, whose will is violated. You will not admit that there are two wills in God, and hence you reject the Gospel. But if the Gospel be rejected, the same difficulty remains entire. There remain two wills in God; one which has made *free* creatures: *that accomplishes itself*. Another which wills us to be good and happy: *that does not accomplish itself*. The mystery is not only in the heights of heaven; it is not only in Golgotha. The whole mystery is discovered in the analysis of the thoughts of an upright man. When one has gone down into these depths, when one has fixed his gaze, for a long time, on these luminous shadows, his mind becomes more reserved, and he is less apt to settle these great questions at the will of a superficial common sense, which thinks all is said when it has repeated that God is too wise to change His laws, and that only the unskilful workman re-touches his work. There is only one workman who makes free beings, and this is the reason that in such a subject all analogy is vain, and leads inevitably to error. If you believe that evil is in the world, and that the moral law is the manifestation of the eternal will, see what you refuse to God. In the name of His wisdom you refuse to Him pity. In the name of His might you refuse to him the power of re-establishing, by a miracle of love,

* *La Vie Eternelle: sept Discours par Ernest Naville. Troisième Edition. Paris. 1863.*

† M. Foucher le Carcil has discovered in the inedited MSS. of Descartes a sentence worthy of being quoted, *Tria mirabilia fecit Dominus,—res ex nihilo, liberum arbitrium, et Hominem Deum.*

His violated will. No! Those who speak thus have not read well their own thoughts, or they do not believe in a true and living God. And this is indeed the true ground of the difficulty. Deism is disappearing in the movements of modern thought, and giving place to doctrines which, in terms more or less veiled, deny our God.

'This God who is the Father of His creatures; this God who knows us and loves us; this God who is moved at our sufferings;—I will declare all the sublime folly of Christians;—this God who gives Himself in order that man may give himself to Him, is, I know well, an idol in the eyes of a certain philosophy. An idol! and what is the God of these sages? The impassible Geometer of the universe. Less than that, the substance, the law of the world, a Being (they insist especially on the point), a Being without consciousness and without will,—a dead God.....And these men feel deeply that heart and conscience protest against these doctrines: but they harden themselves to fight against themselves; they make a cruel duty of immolating their humanity upon the altar of a pure logic.—No! no! Reason wanders when it thinks to satisfy itself by the sacrifice of the noblest interests of our nature. Truth is known by the sign that it establishes harmony in our inner world. It is not to a philosophy without God, but to Christian science, that is reserved the power of offering peace to the soul, and, at the same time, answering the highest demands of the human mind.'—Pp. 181–186.

It will be seen that we have considered the probability of miracles only on the most abstract grounds, as our argument required. We have not considered the probability of a *Divine* revelation,—which is itself, under any form, a miracle,—on the ground of the very nature of humanity,* or of the condition of mankind before Christianity, and the sad, eager longings and appeals for a communication from God, of those, like Plato, who had urged their speculations to the utmost bound of

* One argument we must insist upon for a moment, though we feel its import to be so vast that a separate article alone could put it in its true force. A French contemporary, himself also a sceptic, feels the cogency of this truth; which he puts thus into the mouth of an interlocutor in a dialogue:—'When I feel my faith in "miracles" vacillate, I see also the image of my God wax dim.....The more of mystery, that is to say, the more of the unknown, and the infinite, the more of heaven is there above our heads, the more of poesy. Ah! be sure the incredulity which rejects the miracle tends to dispeople heaven, and to disenchant the earth. *The supernatural* is the natural sphere of the soul. It is the essence of its faith, its hope, its love. I know well that criticism is specious, that its arguments often appear victorious; but I know one other thing, and perhaps I could recall you here to your own experience in evidence thereof. In ceasing to believe in miracle, *the soul discovers it has lost the secret of the Divine life*: it is henceforth solicited by the Abyss.' (M. Renan in one place styles God, 'the Father,—the Abyss from which we rise.') 'A fall always more and more rapid drags it farther from God and His angels. The soul loses, one after another, piety, rectitude, genius; soon it lies on the earth, and sometimes in the mud.'—M. Scheier, *Nouvelle Revue de Théologie*, 1858; and see also the close of his remarkable article in the *Revue des deux Mondes* on the *Essays and Reviews*.

human thought, and felt the chill and awful incertitude that enveloped the highest truths: nor have we, for a moment, touched on those supreme probabilities that belong to the inherent nature of Christian miracles, apart altogether from the direct evidence that attests them more surely than any other human knowledge.

We have dealt with this fundamental question in the form in which we have put it, because it is the form in which M. Renan, throughout his work, presents it, and in which, with a terrible reiteration, he enforces it in his other works. We are aware that M. Renan has raised another issue in reference to the Gospel miracles in the Introduction of his *Vie de Jésus*. We regard it only as a feint, an evasion,—which conceals for a moment from his reader (especially if not conversant with his other works) his decided philosophic and *à priori* repudiation of all miracles. Having, then, fully discussed the vital question in debate, a few words will suffice to meet and fence this feint of M. Renan. The passage runs thus:—“None of the miracles with which old histories are filled have taken place under scientific conditions. No miracle has been performed before a company of men capable of establishing the miraculous character of a fact.....In our day, have we not seen almost all classes of the people duped by gross sleight-of-hand tricks, or by puerile illusions? It is not, then, in the name of any philosophy, it is in the name of a constant experience that we banish the miracle from history. We do not say, “The miracle is impossible.” We say, “There has never been, hitherto, a miracle established.” Let a thaumaturge present himself, to-morrow, with guarantees sufficiently serious to be discussed, let him announce himself as able (suppose) to raise a corpse, what would be done? A commission, composed of physiologists, natural philosophers, chemists, persons versed in historical criticism, would be named. That commission would select the corpse, would assure itself that death had really taken place, would appoint the room in which the experiment should be made, would arrange all the system of precautions necessary, to leave no ground for doubt. If, on such conditions, the resurrection took place, a probability almost equal to a certainty would be established. As, however, an experiment must always be capable of repetition, as we must be capable of doing again what has been done once, and as in the case of a miracle there can be no question of ease or difficulty, the thaumaturge would be invited to reproduce the marvellous act under other circumstances, upon other corpses, in another assembly. If, each time, the miracle succeeded, two things would be proved. (1.) That supernatural facts have taken place in the world. (2.) That the power of producing them belongs to, or is delegated to,

certain persons. But who does not see that no miracle has ever been performed under these conditions?'*

M. Renan here follows precisely the lead of the philosopher Hume, who, after the most conclusive arguments and dogmatic assertions that a miracle was necessarily false, since it was impossible, yet is constrained to write, his philosophy yielding before the innate antagonism of common sense,—'I own there may possibly be miracles, or violations of the usual course of nature, of such a kind as to admit a proof from human testimony; though perhaps it will be impossible to find any such in the records of all history. Suppose all authors, in all languages, agree that from the 1st of January, 1600, there was a total darkness over the whole earth for eight days; suppose that the tradition of this extraordinary event is still strong and lively among the people; that all travellers who return from foreign countries bring in accounts of the same tradition without the least variation or contradiction;—it is evident that our present philosophers, instead of doubting that fact, ought to receive it for certain, and ought to search for the causes whence it might be derived.'† Both these redoubtable adversaries of miracle, then, are obliged to concede, in complete reversal of their own positions, that there is no absolute *à priori* impossibility in a miracle. Its acceptance or rejection is to be determined purely by the sufficiency of the evidence required. That they differ as to the kind of evidence that would be required to avouch a miracle is plain from the passages we have cited from each. Now, then, let us consider M. Renan's demand as to the only evidence that can attest a miraculous narrative. Let our reader for a moment read again the miracle which Hume affirms is of a sort that human testimony can certify, or let him take the case which Leslie gives in his *Short and Easy Method with the Deists*, and he will then discover, with us, that Christianity insists upon the right qualifications in the evidence of miracles, which M. Renan does not. 'For example,' says Leslie, 'suppose any man should pretend that yesterday he divided the Thames, in the presence of all the people of London, and carried the whole city, men women, and children, over to Southwark, on dry land, the waters standing like walls on both sides, I say it is morally impossible that he should persuade the people of London that this was true, when every man, woman, and child could contradict him, and say that this was a notorious falsehood, for that they had not seen the Thames so divided, nor had gone over on dry land.' Now we ask, in case of either of these miracles,—a total darkness covering a country for a week, or the population of a city crossing the bed of a

* Introduction, pp. 50–52.

† Hume's *Essays*, vol. ii., sec. 10, pp. 150, 151. Ed. 4to. London. 1778.

river whilst the waters were divided like crystal walls on either side,—what advantage in the world would a witness to these facts, plain, palpable to the ordinary senses of every person, have, if he were an astronomer, a hydrographer, or a historical critic? It is testimony to facts, and not explanation of them, that is sought; and, for that purpose, ordinary perception, integrity, and freedom from any specific, even modified, hallucination or moral bias, are the requirements insisted upon in individual witnesses. Multiplicity, agreement, and minute coincidence of evidence, along with the impossibility of collusion, these are the momenta that give weight to collective evidence. And no writers have so fully insisted upon the severity with which evidence in proof of miraculous facts should be tested as Christian Protestant writers; since by those rigorous tests alone can the grandeur and overwhelming force of that evidence be disclosed. But miracles are only facts, and no other evidence is required to certify them than the sort which certifies other facts. We have introduced our reply to M. Renan in this form to make intelligible our twofold criticism on his objection to the testimony for Christian miracles.

1. The example which M. Renan gives of a miracle narrows unduly his view of miraculous facts; and the requirements for evidencing one miraculous fact, he unphilosophically demands for all. Now we allow that there are certain kinds of facts of which scientific men would be alone competent witnesses,—those, viz., which required for their apprehension a trained sense, such as the facts evolved in fine chemical analysis, &c. We may concede, further, that where the resurrection of a dead body took place under one condition, scientific witnesses would be preferable,—*i. e.*, where the death was recent, and where the reality of the death would need to be judged by those finer tests of auscultation, &c., which only scientific men could apply: though their discernment is hardly more accurate than that of common people, and, in cases of profound catalepsy that have been mistaken for death, they are as liable to be deceived as anxious friends. But where death had taken place some time, or where infallible signs of death were visible, then we demur to M. Renan's superfluous demand for science as well as veracity in the witnesses of a resurrection. The evidence of one honest man is as good as another, if that dead body has been raised to *life*—by which we mean, not roused to galvanic irritability, but raised to all the ordinary functions of life. Scientific knowledge avails nothing here. It is the fact—a dead man, who by infallible signs was known to be dead, has come to life again—that is in question; and we affirm, not the man with scientific theories on life and death, but the man who saw him oftenerst after

he came to life, and vindicates his testimony by the mightiest pledges of veracity, is the best witness of that fact. But what of other miraculous facts that do not yield such a plausible ground for M. Renan's criticism, but are equally miraculous? What if there be midnight darkness all through the morrow? Will not one man be as good a witness of this fact as another? Will a *coterie* of astronomers be better observers of the darkness than any other assembly of men having ordinary eyesight? And will the record of that fact by a man whose word is known to be inviolably true, whose life is honour, be less trustworthy than that of an oculist, whose surgical and scientific skill is admirable, but whose probity is questionable? Nay, further, we would remind M. Renan that scientific men are as prone to see facts through theory or prejudice as other men,—perhaps more so,—and that, consequently, in questions of mere fact, facts patent to common observation, no superiority has ever been given to their evidence over that of other men in the courts of law. Whereas, in dubious subjects that require delicate investigation, it is generally found in our legal courts that scientific men, from the narrowness and intensity of their special studies, are prone to a slight hallucination, which exaggerates and perverts phenomena, and enables them, according to their bias, to give contradictory evidence even on facts, so that their testimony is always received with caution. An English public would rather take the judgment of the twelve ordinary Englishmen of a jury on any matter of fact affecting life and death, than that of such a commission as M. Renan desiderates.

Christian apologists have always divided the question of testimony into these two parts. (1.) Is the fact one that could be certainly apprehended by those that professed to witness it? (2.) Is the character of those who make this profession such as makes their testimony trustworthy? With regard to the first question, we do not think M. Renan can be more discriminating and exacting than Leslie, whose two rules are: ' (1.) That the matter of fact be such, as that men's outward senses, their eyes and ears, may be judges of it. (2.) That it be done publicly in the face of the world.' And we confess that we would rather believe a thaumaturge, to use M. Renan's objectionable epithet, who fulfilled these conditions in the miracles he wrought, than if he satisfied any commission of scientific men. But the Christian Church has always felt that the second question is the most important, because it awakens the gravest suspicions. And, again, we declare that such evidence of integrity as the early Christians gave, is not likely to be afforded by any scientific commission, however elevated may be the character of the gentlemen composing it; and, there-

fore, it will remain a far securer basis of faith than that which M. Renan would lay.

But, 2. M. Renan plainly confounds two different things; and, by a common sophistry, has, in his own mind, transferred the requirements for one thing to another. He confounds the evidence for a fact, with its explanation. This is plain, from his allusion to sleight-of-hand tricks, and other gross illusions; and, unless we trenchantly separate two things that widely differ, many will be misled by this specious reference and argument. But, observe, Mr. Faraday discovered that the rotation of the table in our table-turning *séances* was caused by the muscular action, which, though not under conscious volitional direction, was excited unconsciously by the mind in its state of expectancy and desire. He explained the fact, but *he did not deny it*. If any number of scientific men had sat as a commission of inquiry in a table-turning *séance*, they must have borne their witness to the fact that the table turned, or been dishonest men. Similarly they must have testified that raps were distinctly heard on or under the table; for this fact was indubitable. Nor is its truth affected by Professor Anderson's illustrations of the mode of rapping that is or may be practised. Similarly, all who go to see M. Robin or M. Houdin must, unless they lie, depone to what they have seen or not seen. The marvellous fact witnessed remains true, even though they know at the time the scientific apparatus or the dexterous craft by which it is done. Scientific men may profitably meet in commission to inquire into the causes of any phenomena, and their decision in such an issue will be received as authoritative; but as witnesses of a phenomenon which is such that men's outward senses, their eyes and ears, may be judges of it, they are only on a par with other men. And now we point to the Gospel miracles. They are facts of the sort described. They are done publicly in the face of the world. Scientific knowledge could give no new or clearer perception of the reality of these facts. The lack of it could not hinder or dull that perception. And the veracity of the men who witnessed them has been approved under every test that could scrutinise and determine it. These facts scientific witnesses could not have denied, unless they were dishonest men. Nor can scientific men deny them now, unless they dishonestly abandon every principle of evidence which is the basis of experience, and therefore alike of history and of science. But scientific men may try to explain them. They have shown that gunpowder, and the compass, marvels of the East, are products of human art. They have developed, by new combinations, greater marvels than men had ever dreamt of, in the telegraph and the

steam-engine. They have explained the phenomena of the liquescent blood of Saint Januarius, and of the winking images of the Virgin. Have they given any explanation of the Gospel miracles? Science cannot repudiate the facts;—that is beyond its province. Can it explain them? Already we have discussed this important subject. And now we close by reminding M. Renan that since Christianity was established, the scientific schools of the world (including those Greek schools of science to which M. Renan refers, and which, he says, already held to the inviolability of nature) have sat as a commission upon these uncontroverted facts, and that as they have more clearly mapped the bounds of science and of nature, so have they discriminated more clearly between a marvel and a miracle. They have established the momentous truth, that these facts are impossible to natural law, and that they are thus supernatural. Science has added to the authority of the Gospel miracles, by removing the only question that could be raised for dispute upon them as to the limits of natural law, and the possibility of these facts, called miraculous, being after all natural phenomena, the result of unknown natural agents or forces.

III.* M. Renan, having repudiated the miraculous narratives and the supernatural pretensions of the Gospels, attempts to show how Christianity sprang from natural causes. Its success he attributes to its pure elevated monotheism, which commended itself to the nations which had become too enlightened to accept their old idolatries. He must next account for this monotheism, and show it to have a human origin. It is with M. Renan a product of race, a result of blood. 'It is the Semitic race which has the glory of having formed the religion of humanity. Even beyond the bounds of history, the Bedouin patriarch who remained in his tent pure from the disorders of a world already corrupt, prepared the faith of the world.† This thought expresses a deep, and he thinks scientific, conception that regulates his entire philosophy of human history. We see the development of his conception in his *Histoire des Langues Semitiques*. 'It is the glory of the Semitic race to have reached, in its earliest days, the notion of the Deity, which all other peoples have been obliged to adopt from it, and upon the faith of its preaching. Monotheism is never discovered. India, which has thought with so much originality and depth, has not yet arrived at it in our days: all the force of the Greek mind would not suffice to bring mankind so far without the co-operation of the Semites. We can affirm that not even

* Part of our argument in this division is borrowed from M. Laboulaye.

† *Vie de Jésus*, pp. 5, 6.

they would ever have attained the dogma of the Divine unity, if they had not found it in the most imperious instincts of their hearts.*

'Who will dare to say, that in revealing the Divine unity, and in finally suppressing local religions, the Semitic race has not fixed the foundation stone of the unity and progress of humanity?'† Now this is quite in accordance with the method of positive philosophy, which makes every phenomenon of history a product of natural conditions in humanity, but which has to introduce the phenomenon itself into those conditions before it can extract it thence again. Man embraces monotheism because the Semitic people embraced and preached it. Well, how did they embrace it? Because it was one of their imperious instincts. You have a monotheistic condition before you can form a monotheistic faith. And if we press the inquiry farther back, and ask, How came that imperious instinct of the people? who and what made the difference between them and others? no answer is given. But we dispute altogether M. Renan's theory of the facts of human history, as we repudiate his philosophy of them. There is another philosophy, which alone explains these facts, and which is of the more esteem in our eyes because it is biblical and, we hold, of Divine authority. We do not at present adduce the evidence which shows that all the Indo-European nations in their origin were monotheistic,—evidence which M. Renan strangely overlooks.

The Aryans, when they first entered India, believed in one God.‡ The early Zoroastrian religion, which was the ancient religion of the Bactrian heights from which the Indo-European tribes all sprang, appears, from recent remarkable discoveries, to have been free from that dualism with which in after ages the worship of Ahriman depraved the worship of the one Good Being,—God. The Pelasgian mysteries and Celtic Druidism are both supposed to have maintained monotheistic traditions amid the flagrant corruptions of the popular idolatry. We believe that all the idolatries of the world are the corruptions, the heresies of the true faith. But, letting this pass, we come nearer to M. Renan's theory. 'According to M. Renan, the religious character of the Semitics is one of those natural and primitive facts which science endorses, but which it is not its function to discuss. All science commences with given data, and rests upon a certain number of irreducible facts.' But is this the case in reference to the monotheism of the Semitic peoples? We think not. The historical importance of race is a discovery of our times, and its importance is exaggerated,

* P. 5, *et in aliis locis*. See also, *Etudes d'Histoire Religieuse*.

† P. 88, *et al. loc.*

‡ See Max Müller's *Comparative Mythology*; and Bunsen's *God in History*.

as is common with new discoveries. What is only an element in the life of a people, as of an individual, has been made to determine all: the ideas, beliefs, destiny of nations,—all has been fatally determined, not, as formerly, by the influence of the stars, but by that of birth and blood. M. Renan exemplifies this exaggeration of an undeniable influence in making monotheistic faith the exclusive appanage of the Semitics, and a sort of peculiar function of their souls. The facts of history disprove his theory. At the side of the Hebrews and the Arabs, the monotheistic Semites, there were Phenicians and Babylonians,—pagan Semites; and the history of the Bible is a record not only of the idolatries practised by the Semitic tribes bordering on Israel, but of the tremendous proclivity, the fatal weakness of the Israelites themselves towards idolatry.

Now if the worship of the only God has preserved Jews and Arabs through so many centuries and so many revolutions; and if mere race has not prevented the Phenicians and Babylonians, who were idolaters, from mixing with other pagan peoples, and disappearing along with them from history; is it not evident that here are two phenomena here—religion and race—of unequal value? Is it not evident that it is religion alone, and not birth or race, which has maintained what still remains of the Semitic people; and that, consequently, we must not make this faith the special prerogative of the *whole* race, simply because they who did have that true faith alone remain of that race? 'This,' as M. Laboulaye says, 'is not a problem of trifling moment. The problem is, to know whether Judaism and the religions that flowed from it (Christianity, of course, being the chief) are the natural product of the genius of a certain people; or if, on the contrary, there is here a mystery which science has not yet penetrated, and before which science will perhaps be obliged eternally to bow. What is certain, and what to-day accords with the present state of our knowledge, is, that it is not *race* but *religion* that rules and has ruled in the history of the Jews. These are two distinct things, and one cannot be explained by the other.'—No! Religion is not derived from race. The religion of the Jews, which gave its monotheism to Mahommedanism, and is the root of our Christian faith, is a mystery to science; for the origin of man's faith, like the origin of himself, is found in God alone. It is not a cause which science can discover. It is the supernatural fount from which our nature is derived, and from which also that faith which alone can satisfy and save it has sprung. God, who revealed Himself unto Adam, and who spake in times past unto the fathers and the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son.

BRIEF LITERARY NOTICES.

Mediatorial Sovereignty, the Mystery of Christ, and the Revelation of the Old and New Testaments. By George Steward. In Two Vols. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1863.

THESE volumes are published as a contribution 'to the sacred cause of evangelical truth.' The purpose of the writer, as indicated in his very eloquent preface, is to present to the Church of Christ a fuller estimate of the wealth of her inheritance *doctrinally considered* than is generally entertained. He is probably right in his inference that, with all the religious activity of this age, 'there is a strange absence of the higher exercises of spiritual thought, of profound doctrinal investigation, and of the elements of a true Christian philosophy.' The religious literature of the day is either sensational or severely critical. On the one hand we have a series of sickly and mawkish works, which, reaching to scores of editions, threaten to eat out all the manliness from religion; and on the other hand we have a criticism which busies itself with the particles of Revelation, or deals only with the outworks, or treats of subjects which are related merely to the history and structure of the Bible. The doctrinal treatises of the day are little more than digests of 'the articles, institutes, and morals of revelation.' Nor is this the worst feature of the times. 'Truth,' says Mr. Steward, 'seems half shorn of her prerogatives of authority and sufficiency, and aids are sought out for her in alien alliances and influences, lest her waning sceptre should pass away. We see too little of the evidences of her supremacy in her pledged servants and guardians,—too little of the bold *testifying* spirit, characteristically apostolic. There is not apparent in the Churches of our day enough of supply and demand for the higher forms of Christian truth, but rather an acquiescence in routine,—in a lower staple of doctrine,—in what is deemed practical religion,—or in the overridden exercise of preaching the Gospel, which, while a pass-word for orthodoxy, is too often but a stereotyped form of evangelical common-place.' Bold as these words are, there is too much truth in them. The prevalent tastes are not in favour of authoritative doctrinal enunciation; nor do they tend

towards 'the deep things of God.' As his offering towards a better state of things, Mr. Steward gives the Church a work which resolves itself into 'a Christology, so conceived and wrought out as to comprise the entire foundation and superstructure of the Bible.'

Two introductory chapters are devoted to the propositions, that Sovereignty is the aspect of Deity most open to man, and that the Scripture is the authentic depository of the Divine Sovereignty in relation to the human race. The grand fact attested by the Bible is the mediatorial rule, in its preliminaries, and in its administration. The one office, to which its diversified facts and phases are subordinate, is to bring out the idea of mediation in the form of a history. In other words, the Bible is *a history of the Christ*, whose mediatorial rule alone explains the problems of life. This is the principle which Mr. Steward maintains and illustrates. He finds it at the very beginning. Dismissing all irrelevant speculation, and forbearing to entangle himself in the discussion of so-called scientific discrepancies, he discovers in the first chapter of Genesis 'a primeval record of Sovereignty.' It comes out more boldly in the *test* which it pleased God to impose upon Adam, inasmuch as that test was not necessary, but simply statutory, arising out of the Divine will, and not out of law. The suspension of the penalty of disobedience indicated the modification of the primitive law, and the introduction of new principles of rule. The seat of sovereignty was removed from the sphere in which law had been declared and broken, and 'transferred to a spot more consonant to new purposes and new principles of rule.' 'Paradise is shut and guarded; but from the wings of the cherubim there beams a glory over the new abode of man, like that which beamed on the tents of Israel in the wilderness, bright, but not overpowering,—a signal of approach to man,—not to warn him off, or to bid him hide his face. These outspread wings do indeed hold the lightnings and the thunder wafting death on the head of presumptuous impiety; but they are the canopy of penitence and grief, a refuge from the heat, and as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land.'

The doctrine of a Mediatorial Sovereignty thus plainly intimated is further confirmed by the federal character of Adam, and its influence on the Fall; an element of truth only to be understood on the presumed existence of some wider economy of moral rule, by combination with which it may be interpreted: for this federal character, apart from some such economy, would involve a violation of the most sacred principles of moral administration, and present an enigma as perplexing in its aspects toward the Divine character, as it would be terrible in its bearing upon ourselves. Our knowledge of God entitles us to infer, that the upholding of the federal system, thus deranged in its outset, declares *an existing counterpart exactly answerable, and thoroughly remedial*,—a duplicate of it in its main features, and itself federal. 'If then,' Mr. Steward argues, 'there be a first man as a federal person, there must be a second also, precisely

answerable to him ;' and the same nature which supplied the federal type must furnish the Federal Anti-type, who must also, for obvious reasons, be Divine. The arrangements are assignable not to *justice*, but to *sovereignty*. It was the gracious prerogative of Him who worketh all things after the counsel of His own will, to impute 'the acts and sufferings of a Divine Person in our flesh as meritorious, federally as well as personally considered, consigning the whole fruit of these to the account of our race.'

Upon this basis of inductions Mr. Steward proceeds to build up his theory, by an elaborate examination of the proofs, direct and indirect, which are furnished by the word of God. Pursuing the order observed in all Christologies, but differing from them in the prominence given to the doctrine of the Mediatorial Sovereignty, his first appeal is to the Old Testament. The Divine titles, the forms of Divine manifestation, the various features of the primitive faith and worship,—such as the covenants, the existence of the Church, the types, the theocracy, and the burden of prophecy,—attest the doctrine in question. Passing to the New Testament, he cites the personal and official titles of the Messiah, His ministry, His acts, His death, resurrection, and ascension. Then follows the testimony of the Holy Spirit to the Mediatorial Sovereignty of Christ, as furnished by the ministry and writings of the Apostles. The argument closes with the Church, as the kingdom of Christ, in its economy, in its nature as a remedial institute, in its historical characteristics, its relations to the world, its administration and prospects, its consummation and glory.

No rapid analysis, such as our limited space compels, can do justice to the variety of subjects discussed in these volumes, and to the elaborateness of their treatment: for the work, though not professedly, is really a *résumé* of the great body of evangelical doctrine, not merely in its fundamental principles, but in many of its minor details. The subject is treated throughout with great originality and beauty, and almost every page betrays the hand of a master. But it must be confessed that Mr. Steward's logic is not always exact, nor are all his theories admissible. We should be very sorry to endorse some speculations, which, though reverently conceived, are venturesome, and without adequate data. We confess, too, to an utter inability to understand some theories, wrapped as they are in an impenetrable haze. Too often the philosopher is merged in the speculatist, and sometimes in the rhapsodist. Those who are familiar with Mr. Steward's previous works, and who have had the privilege of listening to his ministry, will be prepared to detect some blemishes, and to forgive them. The stately and very eloquent language of these volumes savours of a taste which prevailed some thirty years ago, but which, in these matter-of-fact days, is passing away. Mr. Steward is lavish of words; but it must be said, that in his case words are never the substitute for thought, or the apology for its absence. His grand and majestic sentences are but the settings of gems; and the only fear is, that the beauty of the

thought may be eclipsed by the splendour of its garniture. While, however, we challenge many of his theories, and pass strictures upon his style, we cannot too much admire the dignity which distinguishes his work. It exhibits throughout the consecration of a really great intellect, an exuberant imagination, and a devout heart, to the praise of the Redeemer.

Essay on Religious Philosophy. By M. Emile Saisset, Professor of the History of Philosophy in the Faculty of Letters at Paris. Translated, with Marginal Analysis, Notes, Critical Essay, and Philosophical Appendix. In Two Vols. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1863.

THE original draft of this essay, as we are informed by the translator, obtained the prize offered by the Academy of Moral and Political Sciences on the following subject: *Examen Critique des principaux Systèmes modernes de Théodicée*. The second edition carried off the first of the great Monthyon prizes of the French Academy. It combines in a remarkable degree the qualities of brilliance and profundity.

After an introduction, in which M. Saisset sketches the course of his own questionings and thinkings on the great problem of the Divine personality, and shows how he has been led into the studies and to the conclusions of which a view is presented in the essay, we enter upon the first part of the work, consisting of Historical Studies on the Theism of Descartes, the system of Mâlebranche, the pantheism of Spinoza, on 'God in the system of Newton,' on the theism of Leibnitz, the scepticism of Kant, and finally the pantheism of Hegel. We are thus prepared to accompany the essayist through the second portion of his work, which consists of nine meditations, of which the successive subjects are the existence of a God, the possibility of truly knowing God, and of holding fellowship with Him, the possibility of creaturely existence as dependent upon God, and yet apart from Him, the problem and the glory of creation, the eternity and infinity of the world, Divine Providence in the universe, Divine Providence as exercised in relation to man, the mystery of suffering, and spiritual religion.

All this is followed by a masterly essay from the pen of the anonymous translator, and an appendix of illustrative passages from other works of M. Saisset.

We are afraid to begin to write in a brief notice respecting this very remarkable and valuable production; the points which tempt observation are so many, and open out to view questions of such profound interest, and at the same time of such oppressive difficulty and mystery. M. Saisset is one of the few men competent to deal with the pantheistic controversy. He has profoundly studied its history; he is familiar with all its schools; without yielding himself up to it, or ever relinquishing his faith in a personal God, he has yet opened his mind to understand the intellectual tendencies and crav-

ings from which it springs, and with the calm eye of his reason has recognised its 'fascinations.' The problem of creation has been his study for many years. He has pondered the various theories by which the ancients attempted in vain, unlighted by the true idea of creation, to bridge the gulf between the Eternal Self-existent and the shadowy and changing world; following the entire course of their speculations, and 'visiting,' as he says, 'in turn the Stoic and Alexandrian schools, Zeno and Chrysippus, Plotinus and Porphyry, Scotus Erigena and the heterodox Mystics of the Middle Age.' He has studied the Neo-Platonists of the *Renaissance*, Servetus and Giordano Bruno. He has mastered the ideas of Descartes, his *à priori* argument for the existence of God, his mechanical laws, his vortices, his infinite universe; and shows how his conception of a world which acts and re-acts, which undergoes transmutation and development, all in virtue of the original creative act, and apart from any present voluntary Providence of the Creator, verges towards pantheism; as also how the Cartesian doctrine, that truth and morality depend on the arbitrary will of God, degrades and demoralises the conception of Deity. He has studied with admiring dissent the all-absorbing, all-engulfing theism of Mâlebranche, the very antithesis of the Fichtian egoistic pantheism, and which, by completely effacing creaturely individuality and will, and so merging all in God, becomes itself in a sense a pantheistic theism. He has meditated on Spinoza, until, notwithstanding his high admiration of his intellect and character, he has obtained a clear and conclusive view of the fundamental fallacy which lodges in Spinoza's definitions, and which underlies his method, and of the clusters and lines of fallacies which pervade all the pretended demonstrations of the quasi-mathematical metaphysician and pantheist. He has sat at the feet of Newton, that from him he might learn the laws and harmonies of the universe, questioning meanwhile his peculiar theory respecting space as the universal 'sensory' of Deity. He has perhaps too nearly been mastered by the spirit of the acute and encyclopædic Leibnitz; whose *Theodicy*, *Pre-Established Harmony*, and ideas as to the eternity and infinity of the universe, have, as we think, contributed materially towards the formation of M. Saisset's own views. He has applied himself to the austere discipline of that grand sceptic, Kant. He has listened, with what patience and docility he could command, to the high priest of that transcendental reaction from the Kantian scepticism which culminated in the logic of Hegel, and which, while it is subsiding in Germany itself, is at this time penetrating and tincturing the sceptical philosophy of France and England.

After such a training, such a *παρασκευή*, M. Saisset was prepared to enter the lists with modern pantheism, as he has done in the second part of his work. We do not hesitate to characterize his argument against pantheism as by far the most masterly and complete which, so far as we know, has yet appeared, at least in modern times. M. Saisset combines and harmonizes, in admirable proportion

and perspective, the diverse yet concurrent arguments which have been employed by philosophers and divines to prove the existence of a personal Deity. He neither neglects the *à priori* nor the *à posteriori* argument: he gives due weight equally to the proof from moral consciousness and from final causes. The only point in which we are disposed to differ from him in this part of his essay is respecting Descartes' *à priori* argument, which appears to us to have little value. We fancy that M. Saisset knows nothing of John Howe. In that great divine, however, he would recognise a spirit kindred to his own; and he would perhaps acknowledge that the argument *à priori* has never been more soundly or judiciously applied than by the author of the *Living Temple*.

M. Saisset has the advantage of knowing all that can be said for pantheism. He puts forth accordingly all the strength of the pantheistic side of the argument. But nothing can be more happy or complete than the way in which he demonstrates that pantheism only escapes from the difficulties which beset theism by involving itself in far greater difficulties, and that in extricating itself from the Christian mysteries it becomes entangled in hopeless contradictions. M. Saisset makes no attempt to deny or to conceal the stupendous mysteries which belong to Christianity, or to evade the pressure of the difficulties which surround it; but he triumphantly maintains that amid all these 'there is not one contradiction.' Whereas pantheism, as he demonstrates, while it is contrary to all our experience and to the most distinct and impressive testimony of our consciousness, is also in itself, from first to last, a mere imposture, a chicanery of words, an everlasting oscillation between atheism and mysticism, a system without basis, or consistency, or reality, which dares not look at its own face in the mirror of a true logic and philosophy, or call itself by its true name.

Nevertheless, there are things in this noble essay from which we gravely dissent. 'The fascination of pantheism' has after all left its trace upon the anti-pantheistic philosopher. The questionable theories, and the unsound mathematical metaphysics, of Leibnitz, also, have made some impression upon M. Saisset, who seems to have perhaps a fonder admiration of Leibnitz than of any of the great masters whom he has studied. M. Saisset's views respecting prayer are not scriptural, and could by no means satisfy any earnest Christian. Moreover, his theory of an infinite and eternal universe, although he may sustain himself by names so great as those of Descartes, Leibnitz, and above all Pascal, has called forth dissentient and deprecatory criticism, of the gravest tone, not only in this country, but in France. To us, indeed, it appears surprising that so accomplished a metaphysician as M. Saisset should not perceive that there can be no such thing as a material infinite. A material creation, 'whose centre is everywhere and circumference nowhere,' is, as Kant has shown, a contradictory conception, an impossibility. What is called the mathematical infinite resolves itself into mere indefinitude, indefinite prolongation or indefinite repetition. The material infinite

is a contradiction in terms. There is but one Infinite; and this has nothing whatever to do with numbers or with dimensions. The self-existent, the Divine, is alone the Infinite. And as to the eternity of creaturely existence,—we mean eternity *à parte ante*, *pre-eternity*,—has M. Saisset ever considered that such a conception, taken with its metaphysical grounds and reasons, implies an eternal repetition and reproduction of all beings and all worlds? that it involves multiplied incarnations of the Son of God? and has he ever asked himself what must be the rank in the universe, what the relation to the Godhead, of those creaturely intelligences, from eternity dependent upon the Infinite Fountain of Being, who have thus possessed, and do possess, an absolute co-eternity of being with Deity? His theory implies, especially when taken with its grounds and reasons, that such intelligences have been ever existent. Their annihilation, after a pre-eternity of existence, cannot of course be thought of. What then must these intelligences be? and what does their creaturehood mean? To us it has ever seemed as if an eternal creation, a creation from eternity, were almost as clearly a contradictory idea as an infinite creation has been proved to be by Kant. We know perfectly well the difficulties which beset the ordinary doctrines as to this profound question; but they do not appear to us to amount to contradictions. This subject, more than any other with which we are acquainted, is fitted to teach us that there are awful depths of Divine mystery into which it is hardly safe to attempt to look.

We may further remark that the fallacy which attaches to the word *infinite*, as frequently used by philosophers and metaphysicians, reappears continually through these volumes, and is nowhere explicated by the author. Descartes, Newton, and Leibnitz, as well as Spinoza, were misled by it. Nothing is more natural than that mathematicians should fail to discern the essential distinction between mathematical and spiritual infinitude, should fail to perceive that the mathematical infinite is in no true sense an infinite at all. But it is surely time that modern metaphysicians and philosophers had got beyond this point. We do not wonder that Leibnitz, with an array of so-called infinite series and of asymptote lines in view, should involve himself in verbal quibbles about infinities of different degrees and different values and different dimensions, about infinities and semi-infinities, which he says are still infinities, and multiple infinities. But we are somewhat surprised that M. Saisset does not teach his readers that all such analogies and illustrations are utterly misleading and useless. We know that $1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{16}$ &c. *ad infinitum* = 2. But what does this equation mean, if expressed as a practical proposition? No more than this, that you cannot actually go on for ever dividing anything into successive portions, the half, the quarter, the eighth, and so on, each of which shall be one-half of the preceding, but that, *if you could, the sum of all the fractional parts—the half, the fourth, the eighth, &c.—would just amount to the one whole, the unit*, on which you began to operate; and that the further you go on in adding the continually bisected

parts to each other, the more nearly you approach to the total sum of the unit. This, and nothing more, is the common-sense meaning of $\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} + \dots$ &c. *ad infinitum* = 1; or $1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} + \dots$ &c. = 2. We remember that by puzzles and quibbles derived from the misapplication (speaking metaphysically) of the word 'infinite' in such series as these, and in the case of asymptotic curves and their asymptotes, good Dr. Olinthus Gregory, in his meritorious *Letters on the Evidences of Religion*, endeavours to lessen the wonder, or to silence the disbeliever, of the holy mysteries of our Christian religion. We could wish there might be an end of all this.

Another fallacy, which recurs in the speculations of philosophers, which misled to some extent our grand Newton, and which is not yet exploded, as the writings of Dr. McCosh and Mr. Calderwood may suffice to prove, relates to the nature of space. Here M. Saisset seems to have the right clue; but hardly follows it with sufficient boldness. Infinite space is but an 'infinite deal of nothing.' Space is neither a substance, as Descartes, followed by Spinoza, made it in effect; nor is it an attribute, as Clarke would seem to have made it; nor is it, as Gassendi taught, something of a nature intermediate between substance and attribute; nor is it even a mode, as many have imagined. Like length or breadth, it is a mere abstraction; or perhaps we might say that it is emptiness, conceived as the possible place of bodily substance. Hence the mysteries and difficulties which have been woven about the notion of space, all collapse and come to nothing.

We see that we have, after all, been unawares drawn into writing a much larger notice of M. Saisset's volumes than we had intended. We have only to add that the Notes and Essay added by the accomplished translator are of high value, and greatly enhance the worth of these volumes; and that the translation, on the whole, is well done, although here and there we have noted not only a want of careful finish, but a few positive inaccuracies.

Egyptian Mythology and Egyptian Christianity, with their Influence on the Opinions of Modern Christendom. By Samuel Sharpe, Author of 'The History of Egypt.' London: J. Russell Smith. 1863.

THIS attractive and well-written book is published in the interest of Unitarianism. As Mr. Sharpe informs us, 'Protestant Europe is even now struggling to throw off those graver errors of the Nicene Creed and the Atonement,' which, with other superstitions, the ancient Church imported into the teaching of Christ; and he is desirous to do his part towards promoting so glorious an emancipation. 'Orthodoxy, or the religion of the majority, as distinguished from the simple religion which Jesus taught and practised,' includes, according to the author, many 'sad and lamentable errors,' which it is a 'weakness' for 'the cultivated man' to hold, and which are in fact the baptized offspring of a primeval Paganism. The doctrines of the

Trinity, of the union of the Divine and human natures in the person of Christ, and of the vicarious sacrifice of the cross, together with other articles of the Christian Creed, Mr. Sharpe explains to be neither more nor less than a reproduction of dogmas belonging to the old Egyptian mythology, which made their way through the Greek mind and the schools of Alexandria into the faith of universal Christendom. In presenting the historical argument by which this theory is to be established, the author first seeks to expound the religious systems of Upper and Lower Egypt respectively, as, it is presumed, they may be gathered from the hieroglyphical inscriptions, the tomb paintings, the funeral papyruses, and other ancient monuments, native or foreign. He then proceeds to discuss in succession the various forms which the belief and worship of the Egyptians assumed under the Persians, the Ptolemies, and the Romans. Last of all he labours to show that the early Christianity of Egypt was an amalgamation of the doctrine of Christ with the older Heathenism of the Delta; that it was this abnormal type of the faith which gave birth to orthodoxy; and that whatever distinguishes the religion of modern Europe from Unitarian Deism is a lineal descendant of that venerable Gospel which the clergy of Thebes and Memphis preached for ages and generations to the worshippers of Amun-Ra, of Kneph, and of Serapis. Mr. Sharpe's logic and theology apart, there is much to commend in the manner in which he has carried out the plan of his volume, as now stated. His pages teem with rare and valuable information. He writes with singular simplicity, clearness, and force. The pictorial illustrations of his topics are numerous, beautiful, and well-selected. Altogether the literary qualities of the book merit high praise. But here our commendation must end. Like all other works of its class, it is marked by a self-complacency, an arbitrariness, and a dogmatism, which can only be accounted for by the tyranny of overmastering prejudice. The statement of facts is often inaccurate, loose, and one-sided. Very much of the reasoning shrivels into nothing at the first touch of the wand of Aristotle or of Port Royal. And for the main argument: the little truth which it contains is so put as to be equivalent to untruth; a whole pyramid of day-dreams is poised upon a pin's-point of history; and the author's thesis remains as purely the creature of the imagination when his labours are ended as when they began. One would think that the day was gone by when an opponent of orthodoxy could hope to fix upon it the charge of denying the Divine unity, much less could venture to array against it the supposed verdict of unbiassed reason and of all true science. This is Mr. Sharpe's vein throughout; and we hardly know whether to admire more the courage or the modesty which prompts him to indulge it. It is very certain that so well-worn a polemic can only take effect with those who are too dull or too inexperienced to perceive the unfairness of it. The instances in which the author substitutes assertion for proof in the working out of his theory, or quietly takes for granted what, to say the least, is open to debate, are too frequent to be enumerated.

This is particularly the case, as may be expected, where the meaning of Scripture is concerned. Thus we are told as something quite certain, that when the Egyptian pictures exhibit Isis piercing with her spear the head of the serpent of evil, 'we see the enmity between the woman and the serpent spoken of in Genesis.' The Jehovah-Nissi of Moses is stated to be the same as Dionysus, the Greek name for Osiris. The 'cherub' who guards the way of the tree of life after the expulsion from Eden, as Mr. Sharpe assures us, is one of the Cabeiri or torturing gods of the Egyptian mythology, whose grotesque and hideous forms adorn the papyruses so often found in the mummy cases. When the Psalmist speaks of his members as having been curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth, our author finds the explanation in the Egyptian conceit, that all life originally sprang of the Nile mud, quickened and organized by the hot rays of Ra, the sun. In the same way we are to account for what St. Peter says of the earth in the beginning being, as Mr. Sharpe translates the words, 'out of water and by means of water.' Readers of St. Paul are not generally aware, perhaps, that when he says, 'There is an animal body, and there is a spiritual body,' the original of the sentiment may be found in those Egyptian pictures which represent man at his death as having two bodies, one earthly and mortal, the other angelic and immortal. Such the author alleges to be the parentage of the apostle's doctrine; and he illustrates by a woodcut, in which a dead man appears with a double body, one red and fallen to the ground, the other blue and standing erect with uplifted hands. We need not multiply examples of this kind of Scripture criticism and exposition. These alone will prepare Mr. Sharpe's readers for other demands which his production makes upon their literary patience. It will somewhat amaze the friends of St. Augustine to be told that he was for 'the greater part of his life' a Manichæan. Does Mr. Sharpe know at what age Augustine died, and at what period of his life he wrote his treatise *Contra Manichæos*? The author states, again, that the 'Christian monks' of Egypt were 'all zealous supporters of Athanasius, and all earnest against the Arian opinions of the Greeks,' but that 'their opinions had undergone but small change' in passing over from their hereditary Paganism to Christianity. Does the writer suppose that any one but himself will believe this? Assuredly orthodoxy has nothing to fear from any such caricature of the facts of history. The affirmation has precisely the same value with Mr. Sharpe's account of the first introduction of the Gospel into Egypt, with respect to which he says, that the Egyptians 'accepted a belief in Jesus by considering Him sometimes a god who had been put to death like Osiris, and sometimes a son of God in the same sense as their own Horus.' After all this it will be no surprise to find our author endeavouring to get rid of the supernatural element in the early part of St. Matthew's Gospel by connecting the chapters which contain it with Alexandria and the ancient fables of Egypt. We have 'historical assurance,' he says, 'that the chapters

in Matthew's Gospel which contain the miraculous birth of Jesus are an after addition, not in the earliest manuscripts.' And in another place he states it as matter of fact that soon after the entrance of Christianity into Egypt there 'were added to the Gospel of Matthew the first two chapters, giving to Jesus a miraculous birth, without an earthly father,—chapters of which we have historic information that they formed no part of the original Gospel.' What would Lachmann and Tischendorf say to this? We do not know what Mr. Sharpe's ideas of 'historical assurance' and 'historic information' may be; but we are quite clear that his Egyptology will receive a very summary dismissal from all who are bold enough to look into it, if it rests on no better foundation than that which supports the marvellous dictum respecting St. Matthew. To be candid, we have by no means a full faith in Mr. Sharpe's religion of the Egyptians, as this volume presents it. We have still less confidence in the parallels which he draws between the mythology of the Nile and the doctrines of the Jewish and Christian Scriptures. Least of all do we believe that the so called Trinities of the Egyptians, and other articles of their religious belief which our author marshals, are in any proper sense the parents of Christian orthodoxy. No student of the sacred volume will deny that its form was determined to a certain extent by the circumstances under which it was written, and by the character of those to whom its several portions were originally addressed. And every student of ecclesiastical history knows, as well as Mr. Sharpe can tell him, that the Greek mind and language, affected and coloured not a little by Egyptian and other foreign influences, had much to do in defining and giving shape to the theology of Christendom. This, however, is a very different state of the case from that which Mr. Sharpe suggests and argues. Even allowing that Egyptian faith and culture have permanently affected the belief of the Church, our author's conclusion as to the errors of orthodoxy is wholly unwarranted. The question at issue is, whether the doctrines usually known as orthodox are or are not the doctrines of Christ and His apostles; and so long as the disciples of the Nicene Creed are satisfied that such is the fact, they are not likely to be frightened from their belief by any bugbear, whether of transcendental philosophy or of Egyptian superstition. What Mr. Sharpe's motive can have been in writing such a book as the one before us we are at a loss to discover. In the very onset he expresses his persuasion that until orthodoxy perceives that its doctrines are so many errors, it will never admit their Pagan origin; and to undertake, in this position of affairs, to trace these doctrines by an elaborate argument to an origin of this very description is, in our view, an all but unexampled instance of literary Quixotism. We greatly regret that our author, whose learning and talents entitle him to so much respect, should occupy himself in the vain task of attempting to write down inspiration, Providence, history, and common sense.

The Gentile and the Jew in the Courts of the Temple of Christ: An Introduction to the History of Christianity. From the German of John J. I. Döllinger. By N. Darnell, M.A. Two Vols. London: Longman and Co. 1862.

DÖLLINGER'S *Gentile and Jew* is one of the most magnificent books of the present century, and should be well thumbed by all who would understand the History of the Faith of Christ. It is, not, of course, an original conception of the author's, that a knowledge of Christianity presupposes a knowledge of the Paganism and Judaism which went before it and determined the sphere and the character of its early operations. But Döllinger has been the first to attempt a complete survey of this vast field of vision; and, what is more, the success of his enterprise is only equalled by the boldness and breadth of view which led him to undertake it. The latter part of his work contains an admirable critical sketch of the religious history of the Jewish people—a sketch which we commend to any who have suffered or are in danger of suffering from the profane and arbitrary speculations of Renan and his school. But Döllinger's great glory is the picture which he gives us of the Heathenism which preceded and attended the birth of the Gospel. He travels the whole cycle of it: its origin, its development, its manifold varieties, its belief, its worship, its orgies, its philosophy, its morals, its entire character and life, so far as they come within the range of religion. India, Persia, Babylonia, Egypt, Greece, Rome, and a host of other lands, move in succession before the eyes of the reader; and wonderful and most impressive is the panorama which they form, as depicted by the reverent feeling, the philosophic genius, the masculine erudition, and the rich pictorial eloquence of Dr. Döllinger. We know of no commentary on Scripture to compare with this for the illustration which it affords of the grand principles of Revelation, and of the Divine Government as Revelation exhibits it. The wisdom of God, the 'depths of Satan,' the 'mystery of iniquity,' the unspeakable subtlety, tortuousness, and immorality of religious error, stand forth here in a daylight such as never before discovered them to the view of Christian scholars. At the same time the relations which the Paganism, thus marshalled and unveiled, held to the Christianity of the first two centuries, and the mutual influence which the one exerted upon the other, are carefully kept in view by the author, and are presented with much force of argument, and with a graphic energy of description which never fails or flags. Dr. Döllinger enjoys the rare good fortune of having a translator who understands him, and has done him justice. We have seldom met with an English rendering of a German book at once so idiomatic and so true to the original as this able reproduction of *The Gentile and the Jew* by Mr. Darnell. Both the translator and the publishers deserve the warm thanks of all who addict themselves to the study of Ecclesiastical History; and we strongly

advise such persons, and particularly those of them who contemplate or exercise the Christian ministry, to lose no time in mastering the contents of this profound and valuable book.

The Gospel History: a Compendium of Critical Investigations in support of the Historical Character of the Four Gospels. By Dr. J. H. A. Ebrard. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark: 1863.

OUR theological readers need no introduction to Dr. Ebrard. As the victorious opponent of Strauss, as the learned, acute, and uncompromising enemy of the 'negative criticism,' and as a most able and successful defender of the historic truth of the New Testament, his name is familiar to all Christian scholars. The volume mentioned above is a translation of his great book on the Gospels; not such a translation as renders the use of the original superfluous, for it does not give the whole of it; yet one which leaves no very material part of Dr. Ebrard's work unrepresented, and which we hail as a precious addition to the forces with which English Christianity is now doing battle to the spirit of scepticism and unbelief. The chief value of this, as of other polemical writings of Dr. Ebrard, is the positive and constructive character of his criticism: He can distinguish and define to himself and his readers the most subtle creations of the rationalist fancy. He knows how to meet the shadows on their own ground, and to fight them with their own weapons. But he is much too wise a man to content himself with merely routing a host of dreams and dogmas. What he aims at is to furnish the student of the Gospels with a positive statement of the case as it actually stands, such as shall contain within itself a reply to all objections. This is the right principle; and Dr. Ebrard has nobly and triumphantly carried it out in his book. The 'introduction' is devoted chiefly to the history of modern criticism and apologetics in relation to the Gospels. It is needless to say that on this subject the author writes with characteristic fulness and accuracy of knowledge; and those who are acquainted with Dr. Ebrard's manner will not be surprised to see him lay ungloved hands on many of the speculations which fall within range of his inquiry. German rationalism has no reason to complain on this score. Like its ignoble English offspring, it takes limitless liberties with the most sacred opinions of others, but is eminently thin-skinned itself; and we have no tears to shed over it, if a controversialist like Dr. Ebrard is not over nice in his manipulations. On the philosophical absurdity of the popular affectation of freedom from religious bias in matters of Scripture criticism, on the utter scientific rottenness of some of the leading rationalistic theories of the Gospel history, and on the value of the constructive method of argumentation for the Christian apologist, Dr. Ebrard writes with a good sense and a trenchant power which must be seen to be appreciated. The main work divides itself into two parts,

the former of which is occupied with a searching examination of the contents of the four Gospels considered as to their form and matter respectively; while the latter, which is much shorter in the translation than in the original, presents a series of important critical disquisitions on various points belonging to the Gospel writings and their history. The first part opens with certain preliminary remarks on the principles followed by the evangelists in their accounts of our Lord's life, and discusses particularly the questions of the sequence of events in the Gospels, as chronological or otherwise, and of the true doctrine of harmony and synopsis. To this succeeds an elaborate and penetrating investigation of the plan and arrangement of the several Gospel narratives, the data as to the succession of facts related in them, and as to their synoptical relation to one another, receiving the special attention which their importance demands. The conclusion to which Dr. Ebrard comes on the general subject of the 'form' of the Gospels is, that while the so-called synoptical evangelists have no intention whatever of following a strictly chronological principle of composition, there is not a single instance in which their records disagree with the proper sequence of events as it appears in the chronological Gospel of St. John, and that, so far as the possibility of obtaining from the Gospels a consecutive and self-consistent history of Christ can certify us of the credibility of their contents, we have most abundant reason to accept them as historically true. The question of the truth of the 'matter' of the Gospels is treated in a second division of the first part of the work; and here the reader will find at once a magazine of unanswerable answers to the leading objections of scepticism, a full and satisfactory resolution of many of the puzzles with which modern thought is apt to perplex itself in studying the evangelical history, and a cumulative argument for the genuineness of the Gospels, which we do not hesitate to pronounce as much a demonstration as any conceivable conclusion of the dialectician or geometer. We do not make ourselves responsible for all Dr. Ebrard's expressions, nor are we pledged to every sentiment which he advances; but we call attention to this portion of his work as effectually disposing of most of the historical difficulties of the Gospels, and as supplying proof which nothing but the stubbornness of prejudice or a fixed purpose to disbelieve can resist, that they are narratives of fact. Students of Scripture who wish to see how the real or supposed difficulties connected with our Lord's Genealogy, for example, or with the Purification of the Temple by Christ, or with the cure of the Gadarene Demoniaics, or with a multitude of similar points, vanish before a clear-sighted and robust Christian intelligence, will do well to track Dr. Ebrard through the series of learned and masterly discussions which make up this section of his book. The latter of the two great divisions of the work already named joins issue with the mythical theory of Strauss, and with other monstrous imaginings of modern Germany as to the origin of the Gospels, and then by a broad and vigorous induction, drawn especially from the pre-Christian expectation of Messiah,

from the character of the apostolic Epistles, and from the life and journeyings of St. Paul, establishes on sure foundations the authenticity of the writings which pass under the names of the four evangelists. With this branch of his argument the author connects what is obviously necessary to the completion of it,—an extended critical inquiry into the actual origin of the Gospels, which, like the rest of the work, teems with the fruits of a rare erudition breaking forth into mighty life under the hand of a no less rare fellowship of genius and Christian feeling. We strongly recommend this solid and invaluable book to all young ministers and students of the New Testament history. It is one of the few works which deserve to be digested into the intellectual substance of their readers; and the wider the circulation of it within the area we have indicated, the better will it be for the cause of genuine learning, of unsophisticated philosophy, and of true evangelic faith. The translator, the editor, and the publishers alike claim our thanks for enabling Dr. Ebrard to speak to multitudes who need his instruction, but who could not, without their assistance, have enjoyed the advantage of it.

The Life of Our Lord upon the Earth, in its Historical, Chronological, and Geographical Relations. By the Rev. Samuel J. Andrews. London: Alexander Strahan and Co. 1863.

MR. ANDREWS defines the purpose of his book as being 'to arrange the events of the Lord's life, as given by the evangelists, so far as possible, in a chronological order, and to state the grounds of this order; and to consider the difficulties as to matters of fact which the several narratives, when compared together, present, or are supposed by modern criticism to present.'

The student of Scripture will at once perceive how valuable such a work must be, if well executed. The genuineness and truth of the Gospel narratives is assumed, the text of Tischendorf being generally recognised as a standard, and his various readings given, where there is any necessity to take into consideration the question of text or of readings. The specialty of the book is, that it endeavours to settle the chronology and order, to fix the topography, and to reconcile the apparent discrepancies, of the New-Testament history, as given by the four evangelists.

'That all will find,' says Mr. Andrews, in his preface, 'the solutions of alleged discrepancies and contradictions here given satisfactory, is not to be expected. Nor will the chronological order, or topographical results, be received by all. But it is a great point gained, to be able to see just what the amount of the discrepancy or contradiction, if it really exists, is. Those readers who have been accustomed to hear, through sceptical critics, of the numerous errors and mistakes of the evangelists, will be surprised to learn how few are the points of real difficulty, and how often these are exaggerated by the misinterpretation of the critic himself.'

We heartily bear our testimony to the industry and ability with which Mr. Andrews has performed his work. The student will find this volume thoroughly up to modern information and requirements on the very important matters with which it deals. It is a seasonable and most valuable contribution to the literature and criticism of the New Testament. Even Ebrard's admirable work will not render this unnecessary. The two will be found to supplement, perhaps in some cases to correct, each other.

Moses, or the Zulu? A detailed Reply to the Objections contained in Parts I. and II. of Bishop Colenso's Work. By the Rev. W. Wickes, M.A. London: Wertheim, Macintosh, and Hunt. 1863.

NOTWITHSTANDING the somewhat 'sensational' title of this work, there is much that is really valuable in it; and all who wish to see a plain but comprehensive explanation of the alleged difficulties and discrepancies of the Pentateuch will find it useful. It is not to be expected that an author should be able to say anything very new or original on a controversy which has called forth many scores of volumes already. Yet those who have kept abreast with the tide of anti-Colenso literature will find it worth their while to read Mr. Wickes' able dissertation on the Jehovistic and Elohistie theory. With this, as well as with the Interpolation theory, Mr. Wickes deals conclusively, and makes out the claim of Moses to the authorship of the whole of the Pentateuch, with the exception of the last chapter of Deuteronomy.

Christianity and Common Sense. By Sir Willoughby Jones, Bart., M.A. London: Longman. 1863.

THIS book is good and well-timed. Without any affectation of learning, and yet with all the graces of the true scholar, the author states the grounds of his belief in the inspired volume, and of his dissent from the new school of theology. Rightly defining the limits of religious inquiry, and showing that the only difference between the scepticism of the past and the present century is, that the latter is distinguished by an increase of knowledge,—the radical defect in both lying simply in the absence of faith,—the writer proceeds to sketch the argument from analogy, which, without advancing anything new, he presents in a clear and popular form, and with striking illustrations. In discussing the credibility of the Divine revelation, he very wisely repudiates the plan adopted by nearly all the orthodox controversialists of the last hundred years,—that of putting the Bible upon the *defensive*, and suggesting objections which might not otherwise have occurred to the reader. The apologetic polemics of the Church have embarrassed rather than assisted the progress of truth. Sir Willoughby Jones, on the contrary, regards the Bible as its own witness, and very ably sustains the claim. A chapter on Historical Evidence, and another on the Witness of the

Spirit to the Truth of Revelation,—in both of which the subject is happily treated,—are followed by an analysis of the popular methods of Bible Elucidation, and by a spirited critique upon some of the most prominent writers of the new school, whom he calls 'Free-handlers,' and among whom he classes the writers of *Essays and Reviews*, Dr. Colenso, and Dr. Stanley. The accomplished successor of Dr. Trench, whose talents all must admire, but whose leanings towards rationalism have long excited the apprehensions of all lovers of the truth, receives from Sir Willoughby a severe but not unmerited rebuke. We have read the book with pleasure. The simple reverence and faith which pervade it are most refreshing; and we believe that its frank and manly treatment of those truths which it is the fashion of the new theology either to mystify or ignore, will be of service to many an inquiring mind.

The Types of Genesis briefly considered, as revealing the Development of Human Nature. By Andrew Jukes. Second Edition. London: Longman. 1863.

WE are glad to see a new edition of this thoughtful and suggestive work, which is probably well known to our readers. Though not disposed to endorse all Mr. Jukes's expositions, some of which are fanciful and overstrained, we cannot but hail the labours of a man who sees in the Divine word far more than the mere letter. When the temple of truth is beset by a crowd of busy men who spend their strength in discussing the details of its architecture, its dates, and its builders, it is pleasant to find one whose ambition it is to penetrate to its shrines and listen to its holy oracles. No devout reader of this book can fail to have his estimate of the hidden beauty of the Scriptures quickened by its pages.

A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Genesis, with a New Translation. By James G. Murphy, LL.D. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

WE would fain speak more highly of this book than our conscience allows us to do. It is a Christian book: the spirit and tone of it are admirable. It is a book not without ingenious speculations and important argument. But it is not a mighty book. It wants grasp and force. Dr. Murphy has done himself injustice by publishing it. He is too thoughtful a man, and too good a Hebraist, to appear with dignity as the author of such a work. Much of the commentary is not commentary; it is easy, flowing remark upon the text, of a kind befitting the preacher rather than the critical expositor. The translation is designed to be 'a revision of the Authorised Version;' but we fear it must be pronounced a failure. A translator into English is bound to write English. Above all a reviser of the Authorised Version should do so. Of course our idiom must bend to a certain extent in translation, so as to meet the requirements of the original. But it must not be bent so as to

break. Dr. Murphy breaks it continually. When we find the work of the days described as that 'which created had God to make,' it is not English we are reading any more than it is Hebrew. And when on the fourth day the Divine word is made to say of the sun and moon, 'Let them have been for signs—let them have been for lights,' we bemoan the wounds of the Hebrew quite as much as those of the language into which it is put. Altogether the scholarship of the volume is wanting in muscle. Why should Dr. Murphy, the 'critical and exegetical' commentator, scatter through his work the jottings which he made in his note-book the first day he used a Hebrew lexicon? To say the least, all this is very ill-judged. We can afford to receive any number of commentaries on Genesis. Even after Kalisch's noble book, we want as many of them as our scholars and divines can give us. But they must not be simply works containing a great deal of Christian sentiment and useful observation. They must be prepared to bear the scrutiny of the scalpel and microscope of an unceremonious scepticism. They must be as loyal as Dr. Murphy's book is to the divinity of the Scriptures and the Gospel; but they will hardly meet the necessity of the times unless this be coupled with a firmer grammatical treatment and a more judicious application of the resources of literature and science than we have been able to mark in this volume.

The Complete Works of Richard Sibbes, D.D. James Nichol. An Exposition of the Prophet Ezekiel. By William Greenhill, M.A. 1650. Edited by Rev. J. Sherman. Edinburgh: James Nichol.

MR. NICHOL'S persevering labour knows no abatement. In his octavo series we have to announce the carrying on of Goodwin's Works to vol. vi., and of Sibbes to vol. vi. Both are highly interesting and suggestive volumes; and among other things which they suggest, thankfulness for the more scriptural teaching of John Wesley is by no means the last or the least. Sibbes's little Treatise entitled *The Fountain Sealed* has always commended itself to us as one of the most useful of the numerous posthumous productions that bear his name, as the beautiful portrait inserted in the title-page of the original editions has always appeared to us one of the most striking evidences of his great popularity as a preacher. But when we find him arguing that the sins of God's people are among the 'all things' that 'work together for good,' not merely to others, but to themselves, we almost involuntarily exclaim with the negro, 'Where be dat in de book?' So of Goodwin. All the treatises in this volume relate to the work of the Holy Spirit in the salvation of men, and the subject is treated exhaustively. But when regeneration is made to precede repentance and faith instead of being preceded by them, we are compelled to feel that the writer does *not* 'speak as the oracles of God;' unless indeed the Puritan and the High-Churchman are at one, and 'regeneration' is come to mean a state of inchoate but not complete conversion.

In the large or royal octavo series we find a volume composed of the works of two very different men :—Jean Daillé, the Protestant pastor of Charenton, whose *Exposition of the Epistle to the Colossians* was, until Mr. Sherman republished it, very scarce and dear, and whose *Exposition of the Epistle to the Philippians* was first published by Mr. Sherman in an English dress. About half of the volume before us is filled with these two works ; the remaining half is occupied with the reprint of two of those 'dumpy quartos' which used to sell for two or three times the price of the present volume—Jenkyn's *Exposition of the Epistle of St. Jude*. William Jenkyn, the author, was a very remarkable man. A royalist under the republic, and a prisoner after the Restoration, it is not easy to say exactly what were his opinions and practices in regard to several questions which then divided the best men from each other. But on the Calvinistic question he went strongly with the majority, and provoked a keen reply from John Goodwin. His cotemporary Baxter calls him 'an elegant and sententious preacher ;' and the epithets, particularly the latter, are well deserved. Those who read for instruction and solid advantage will find it here, and will be disposed to thank the publisher for supplying to them at so small a price so large and truly valuable a volume.—Greenhill's *Ezekiel*, which reaches our hand while we write, is perhaps the most important of the series.

Notes on Ezekiel, Critical and Explanatory. By the Rev. W. J. Shrewsbury. Edited by his Son. London : Hamilton, Adams, and Co.

THE author, a venerable minister of the Wesleyan Church, has been engaged for many years in annotating the whole Bible. These Notes on Ezekiel are, therefore, but a fragment of a greater work, which, if published in full, will be a monument of the judgment, learning, and piety of the author. The difficulty of annotating Ezekiel must be obvious to every student of the prophet. Mr. Shrewsbury, however, has set himself to the task without boldness or affectation ; and his notes, though brief and few, are always conceived in a spirit of reverence, and are often distinguished by originality. Simple enough to meet the requirements of the unlettered Sunday school teacher, they are yet scholarly enough to reward the attention of the student, and practical enough to assist the meditations of all. Some light is occasionally thrown upon a passage by quoting the Dutch version, which Mr. Shrewsbury regards as generally more correct than the English. No marginal references are given ; but great care has been expended in the selection of the many illustrative texts which are embodied in the notes.

T ePower of the Tongue : or, Chapters for Talkers. By Benjamin Smith. London : John Mason. 1863.

MR. SMITH is already known as the author of two little works entitled, *Vice-Royalty*, and *Climbing*. This last fruit of his pen will

sustain the reputation gained by his former productions. As a manual for the young it is worthy of commendation, and all classes may read it with profit. In a second edition, Mr. Smith would do well to omit some comparatively irrelevant chapters, in order more effectually to chastise certain classes of talkers, who are the bane of society, and the curse of the Church. An uncompromising deliverance on social *tittle-tattle* would be of immense service.

The Pulpit Assistant: with an Essay on the Composition of a Sermon. By the Rev. Thomas Hannam. Sixth Edition. London: William Tegg. 1863.

THIS book is probably as good as any others of its kind. Mr. Hannam's theories of sermon-making are well enough. But, for the honour of the pulpit of the day, we are sorry to see a sixth edition of such a volume. It is an encouragement to idleness and incompetency. We once heard a venerable divine complaining that young preachers were not honest enough to 'bungle' now and then; believing as he did that a man had better flounder a little in the utterance of his own thoughts, than glibly rehearse the thoughts of others. We think so too. If a minister, with God's word in his hand, and God's light upon his heart, cannot find something to say without falling back upon the preparations of other men, it is time for him solemnly to consider whether he has not made some mistake in his vocation.

The Pentateuch: and its Relation to the Jewish and Christian Dispensations. By Andrew Norton. Edited by John James Tayler, B.A. London: Longman. 1863.

THE author of this essay published, many years ago, a work on the *Genuineness of the Gospels*, from a long note in which the essay is reprinted. His conclusions as to the age and authorship of the Pentateuch are substantially identical with those of Dr. Colenso, though less rashly and illogically developed. All the principal germs of the Colenso controversy are here anticipated. Mr. Norton's theories would doubtless have excited a discussion as eager and protracted as that which Dr. Colenso has called forth, but for the fact that the former was only a Unitarian professor in an American university, whereas the latter is an Anglican bishop.

California Life Illustrated. By William Taylor, of the California Conference. London: Tresidder.

WE do not wonder that this sketch of missionary life has passed through twenty-three editions. It has an interest beyond that of its evangelical associations. It is more than a bundle of statistics, or a story of work; though as a record of missionary labour and success it is invaluable. It is a picture of the wild and lawless life of the early Californian colonists. The author's descriptions of men and manners and scenery are vigorous and stirring; and they are all the more

valuable because they represent a state of society that is happily passing away. The narrative is full, too, of personal adventure; and none can read it without admiration of the fearless and self-denying zeal of the author, who, in the cause of his Master, threw himself into circumstances intensely trying and perilous.

The Model Preacher: comprised in a Series of Letters illustrating the best Mode of Preaching the Gospel. By the Rev. William Taylor. London: Tresidder.

MR. TAYLOR, as one of the most successful preachers of the Conference to which he belongs, has a right to be heard on the subject of preaching. His letters will repay thoughtful perusal. They are fresh, racy, full of sparkling illustration; and, moreover, they are characterized by broad common sense. Not that we are prepared to adopt all Mr. Taylor's theories of preaching. We should strongly reprobate the wholesale introduction of the 'sensation' element into our pulpits. But Mr. Taylor has had to deal with men of an unusual type, and has adapted himself to circumstances. This, perhaps, is the secret of success. It is not by clinging to inexorable standards that the minister succeeds. He must learn, as the apostle learned before him, to be 'all things to all men.'

American States, Churches, and Slavery. By the Rev. J. R. Balme. Second Thousand. London: Hamilton, Adams, and Co. 1863.

MR. BALME is an American Baptist clergyman, though British born, who has an undying hatred of slavery and all its concomitants. He writes with amazing and uncompromising vigour, and many of his pages thrill with those tales of horror with which we are only too familiar. The leading feature of his book is a tremendous onslaught upon the supporters of the American Union, many of whom, and especially the Beechers and President Lincoln, he regards as worse than the Southern slaveholders; his belief being that the emancipationists are, in the main, haters of the Negro, whose cause they have espoused for purely political capital. Another work of his which lies before us, entitled, *Letters on the American Republic*, is of the same class. We have little faith, however, in the beneficial results of strong personalities. He who would speak with effect in this hour of excitement and blood should speak tenderly and with forbearance.

The Mystery of Money explained, and illustrated by the Monetary History of England, from the Norman Conquest to the present Time. London: Walton and Maberly. 1862.

As a history of money and monetary crises, this book supplies a great deficiency in our national literature. The author, who has been engaged in trade and banking for more than sixty years, exhibits a very competent knowledge of his subject, and presents us with a con-

scientious *résumé* of the financial life of England from the days of William I. But he aims at something beyond history. He has a monetary theory of his own, the exposition of which is the grand purpose of his book. With an utter unbelief in the safety of our present financial system, he attributes all monetary panics, and, indeed, a great deal of the popular misery in this and other countries, to the want of a proper balance between what he calls *mercantile money*,—that is, money emanating from the industry and skill of the people, and which has an intrinsic value,—and *tribute money*,—or money deriving its existence and value from the authority of the state. His arguments are well sustained by illustrative facts; and if he does not quite make good his promise of explaining the *mystery* of money, he advances much that ought to excite the attention of political financiers.

The Funeral Services on occasion of the Death of the Rev. William Crook, late Senior Minister of the Irish Methodist Conference. With a copious Sketch of his Life and Character. Edited by his Eldest Son. Second Edition. London and Dublin. 1863.

THIS is a very graceful tribute to the memory of a great and good man. The editor has given us not only the sermons and addresses which were delivered on the occasion of his father's death,—themselves a noble monument,—but also a succinct and very beautiful sketch, which seems to bring the venerable old man before us, so true is it and picturesque. It would be superfluous for us to dwell upon those graces and qualities which commended the senior minister of the Irish Conference to the love of his brethren, and to the admiration of his people. We hope our readers will acquaint themselves with a character to which the piety of a son has yielded so fitting a homage. We cannot refrain, however, from expressing our obligation to the editor for having given us, in connexion with a sketch of his father's life, many details respecting the labours of other honoured ministers who were engaged in the founding of Irish Methodism. The incidents which are woven into this volume would furnish a valuable contribution to a future history of Methodism in Ireland.

Imagine; or, The Flowers and Fruits of Rome. A Metrical Tale. By M—— H——. London: Wertheim and Co. 1863.

THIS is a somewhat unique contribution to the controversy with Rome. Believing that the younger portion of the community is more likely to be arrested by the imaginative than the didactic, the author has endeavoured to exhibit some of the evils, social and domestic, which result from the teaching and discipline of the Papal Church, under the guise of narrative incidents woven into verse. We cheerfully accord praise to the author for the motive and the

ingenuity of the design. We wish we could speak as favourably of its execution. The story is decidedly interesting, but the proportion of true poetry is small.

Life Unfolding. A Poem for the Young. By Elizabeth Anne Campbell. London: Wertheim and Co. 1863.

THE subject of this poem is the typical character of the dispensation which reached its fulfilment on the cross. The writer has embodied her thoughts in verse, because of her belief 'that the instruction conveyed by types is essentially poetical in its nature.' We entirely agree with the proposition; but, at the same time, we see a material difference between poetry and verse-making; and we fear that the writer's evident purpose to do good will not be realised. The style of the poem is too heavy to interest the young, and too meagre to attract the possessor of poetical taste.

The Mystery of Being: or, Are ultimate Atoms inhabited Worlds? By Nicholas Odgers. London: Tresidder. 1863.

THE object of the author is to prove that 'down in the territories of minuteness, ten thousand times farther than the longest reach of microscopic power, there may exist systems of worlds, equal in splendour and harmony to the astral system, of which the sun and solar system are but one unit.' His language is as high-flown as his argument is ambitious; and it is to be regretted that a book which gives evidence of respectable mental power should be marred by an affectation of fine writing. As to the argument itself, it is so entirely speculative as to be of little force.

Etudes critiques sur la Littérature contemporaine. Par Edmond Scherer. Paris: Michel Lévy Frères. 1863.

THE fashion of reprinting reviews and fugitive pieces prevails to a greater extent in France than in England, or rather it prevails in a somewhat different form. Here a well-known author will frequently collect his scattered essays from the quarterlies or magazines in which they originally appeared, and place them before the public in a more permanent shape. But it is very seldom that he will take the trouble thus to rescue a mere newspaper article or critique. In France, on the contrary, the republication of such articles constitutes no inconsiderable portion of the current literature. Several men, as Sainte-Beuve, Prevost-Paradol, and others, are in the constant habit of gathering their *feuilletons* into successive volumes.

The essays composing the volume now before us appeared in the French newspaper *Le Temps* during the years 1861 and 1862. Among the writers whose works are discussed are De Tocqueville, George Eliot, Michelet, Guizot, Chateaubriand, Thiers, Lacordaire, Prevost-Paradol, Veuillot, Vinet, John Stuart Mill, and Sainte-Beuve. This, as will be seen, offers a pretty wide range of subjects;

and it need not surprise us that they are treated with unequal success. The articles that please us most are those on Michelet, Veuillot, and Chateaubriand, but especially that on Sainte-Beuve.

If we attempt to do for M. Scherer what he has in most cases done so successfully for other people, we shall experience some difficulty. He says himself in the Preface: 'Custom requires that an introduction should epitomize the doctrines of a book. But what if a book has no doctrines? This is a case that does not seem to have been provided for. The fact is, that I see many subjects treated in the following pages: philosophy, religion, literature, history, politics, ethics,—there is a little of everything..... Well, in the midst of all this, seek as I will, I do not discover the smallest shadow of a doctrine.' We confess that we have not been more successful than the author. We also have been unable to find the leading principle of M. Scherer's mind, and to separate in his opinions what is transitory from what is permanent and essential. This perhaps depends in part on the nature of his book; for a critic's personality and individual character are often as difficult to discover as a dramatist's. But in M. Scherer's case the difficulty is increased by the fact, that he scarcely seems to have any very fixed and positive beliefs,—a state of mind which is in a measure explained by what we know of his antecedents. M. Scherer was at one time a Protestant minister and professor of theology in Switzerland; but his faith became unsettled, he allowed his soul to drift from its moorings, and has now for some years abandoned the duties of his office. To what extent his scepticism goes, is rather difficult to say. But it would seem from several passages in this volume, as also from an article on Colenso which appeared a few months ago in the *Revue des deux Mondes*, that he rejects the more positive doctrines of Christianity, and that his religion consists in a kind of vague admiration for what is noble and beautiful. In one place he asks whether the 'supreme reality is not the thought which thinks itself, the dream that knows itself to be a dream, the negation that ceases to be a negation by affirming and recognising itself?' This baseless and uncomfortable line of thought will tend to explain the absence of any very positive teaching in M. Scherer's book.

One of the essays reprinted in this volume created considerable sensation at the time it was first published. It is that in which the author hailed the opening of the Great Exhibition of 1862, and informed his countrymen generally of what they would find in England worthy of their approbation and respect. The article is written throughout in a spirit of generous appreciation which we should be happy to recognise more frequently in the periodical literature of the two countries. Not the least remarkable passage is that in which M. Scherer expresses his admiration for the manly exercises in which most Englishmen delight. We scarcely expect to hear Mr. Kingsley's peculiar doctrines re-echoed from the other side of the Channel, or to meet with a French advocate of 'muscular Christianity.' Yet the foreigner's fine prose almost warms into poetry when he comes

to speak of our great national game: 'We have often thought that the noblest gift which could be made to France, and the most efficacious means of regenerating and revivifying our youth, would be the introduction of some national game, such as the English cricket,—of an exercise capable of inspiring a strong passion, full of emulation, requiring both strength and skill, bringing every physical faculty into play, inviting to healthy fatigue and the enjoyment of fresh air, and thus preparing vigorous bodies for vigorous souls. "Without frankness," said Sir Walter Scott, "there can be no virtue; and without courage there can be no frankness." He might have added, "and without strength there can be no courage." We speak confidently when we say that the Englishman is a magnificent specimen of humanity, and that it is cricket that has made the Englishman what he is.' The value of M. Scherer's admiration for our institutions generally is enhanced by the knowledge he evidently possesses of England and its literature. This knowledge is shown not merely in his essays on the English authors, John Stuart Mill and George Eliot, but by several indirect allusions and illustrations scattered here and there throughout the book.

M. Scherer seems to us to be a man who has lost his way, and is groping somewhat blindly in the darkness. He has considerable powers of mind, and very noble and generous instincts; but unfortunately he has lost those central beliefs on which his intellect as well as his heart might have found a sure resting-place.

The Customs of the Dissenters : being Seven Papers revised and reprinted from the *Christian Spectator*. London: Eliot Stock.

THE preface informs us that these papers are published in response to a general invitation. They are written by a Congregationalist minister, and appeared in what we suppose may fairly be considered a Congregationalist organ. The writer apprehends that 'they form as a whole that which may be taken for a tissue of unfavourable criticisms on modern Nonconformity;' but believes that 'every candid writer will discover' running through them 'a hearty love for the essential principles' of Protestant Nonconformity, 'and a due respect for its best representatives.'

It was said by the lamented Mr. Conybeare in his famous article on Church Parties in the *Edinburgh Review*, that the mottoes of the 'Broad Church' party are Charity and Comprehension; these are evidently also the mottoes of our 'Spectator.' He condemns and would renounce the characteristic distinction of modern Independency, a separate and self-governed Congregational Church, with its single pastor, and would have all the Churches within a manageable area associated with each other, and under the charge of associated pastors and teachers. He does not appear to be aware that in this he relinquishes all distinction in principle between Independency or Congregationalism and such a Connexionalism as that of the different Methodist denominations. He is favourable

also to the use of a liturgy containing fixed elements of worship and song, which may be variably disposed and arranged, and shall be intermingled with free prayer. His picture of the highest class and style of worship in the churches of the Establishment is far more attractive and far more lovingly painted than that of the ordinary worship of the average Dissenting congregation. He also draws out an ideal of worship and of church order and government which he thinks better than anything extant, and which might, as he pleases himself in fancying, form a platform of Christian union and communion on which the enlightened Churchman, Congregationalist, and Wesleyan might all join, in preference to their own comparatively poor and sectarian standards. Altogether the pamphlet is a remarkable sign of the times, and will well repay perusal. We may possibly some day draw attention more at large to this latitudinarian manifesto, in combination with some other publications which have lately appeared.

The Holy Gospels, Translated from the Original Greek: the Spurious Passages expunged; the Doubtful bracketed; and the Whole revised after the Texts of Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford, and Tregelles. With Notes and a Critical Appendix. By G. W. Brameld, M.A., of Lincoln College, Oxford; Vicar of East Markham.

THIS is a carefully executed work by a competent scholar. Such a work cannot fail to be of high value, especially to the earnest student who is not as yet familiar with the criticism of the New Testament. For the most part Mr. Brameld's translation appears to be correct and satisfactory. The light which a carefully revised translation, made from an approved text, with the help of the best modern criticism, and by a man of sound judgment and of Christian feeling, throws upon many passages of the Gospels, is very great. The multiplication of such contributions to biblical science as Mr. Brameld has here given will prepare the way for that much-to-be-desired result—a safe and good, *i. e.*, a true and thorough, revision of our authorised translation. Nothing has pleased us better in this translation than Mr. Brameld's adherence, whenever possible, to the text, and everywhere to the style and manner, of our present English standard. Nevertheless, we are not satisfied that all Mr. Brameld's alterations are for the better. To us, for instance, it appears not a true criticism which renders Πνεῦμα Κυρίου, in Luke iv. 18, by 'A Spirit of the Lord.' We fear that the influence of Mr. Jowett's contribution to the *Essays and Reviews*, which Mr. Brameld quotes in his Preface with high praise and without a caveat, may be traced in such a rendering as this. We may add that by following the authorised version in its rendering of εἰμὴ merely by *save*, in verses 26 and 27 of the same chapter, Mr. Brameld leaves in the text an obscurity—a seeming discrepancy—which is completely removed by simply substituting *but only* instead of *save*.

Theologically Mr. Brameld, we cannot doubt, is broadly lax; and as a critical translator he is not thoroughly awake everywhere. Doctrinal laxity, however, cannot often affect a competent and honest translation of the four Gospels; and it is perhaps a 'good fault' for a reviser of our authorised translation not to be too keenly alert in making alterations. On the whole, Mr. Brameld's publication is one which we can commend as well worthy of the attention of all students of the New Testament.

From the World to the Pulpit. London: W. Freeman. 1863.

THIS book relates the history of a student's course from the time of his deciding to seek the position of a Christian minister until his leaving college. The youth is a Congregationalist, and receives his commendation to the ministerial work from a Congregationalist pastor and Church. His views of the pastoral office, at the time he decided to make it his own, do not appear to have been very solemn; nor does the writer throughout seem to have had any sense of the 'gift and calling of God' in the matter. It cannot be doubted that the substance of the volume is authentic; that we have here the work and a good deal of the actual experience of a theological student. The institution described is evidently the Lancashire Independent College. Portraits which we should take to be tolerably correct are given of Dr. Vaughan, Dr. Davidson, Professor Rogers, and other dignitaries and functionaries of the college; as also of several members of 'the committee,' Dr. Halley among the rest. The taste of the performance, however, may very fairly be questioned. Still, as a view of the interior of a Dissenting Theological Seminary, the picture presented is not destitute of interest or of instruction. The tone, too, is that of good manly sense. But the lack of Christian zeal and devotion, the absence of everything like tender earnestness or holy solemnity of spirit, is painful. Nor are the glimpses which are afforded of the general tone and temper of the students such as are likely to elevate the ideas and expectations of the public respecting 'the schools of the prophets.' We can only hope that the writer has more religion than he suffers to appear in his book; and we do not doubt that there is much more among the inmates of the College than is here revealed. Some men affect more religion than they possess; others rather put forth their more careless than their more serious aspect when they appear in company. The writer may be one of the latter class. His book, however, could hardly have been written by a man of much delicacy or much generosity.

The Divine Mystery of Peace. By James Baldwin Brown, B.A. London: Jackson, Walford, and Hodder. 1863.

MR. BROWN is no favourite of ours. We cannot trust a man who has emphatically expressed in former works his obligations to Mr. Maurice as a thinker and as a theologian. If he fully understands

what Mr. Maurice's theology is, such a man cannot himself be a sound or orthodox theologian. If, as is perhaps the case, he does not fully understand the depths and windings of the Maurician mysticism, then his public profession of admiration and obligation betokens his own weakness. In the present volume, however, we are not sure that there is any unsound doctrine, though there is a certain amount of doctrinal obscurity. The style is too emphatic, too big, too ostentatiously 'muscular,' too spasmodic, too 'loud.' We presume that such a style finds favour with many readers. We, however, desire quiet power, or swift incisiveness, or truly fervid and impressive eloquence, or meditative beauty, or calm searching words of insight, or solid argument. Of all things we dislike an uneasy, a 'forceful-feeble,' or an ambitiously unusual style. Mr. Brown seems always afraid lest he or his hearers should cease to feel that he means to be in earnest,—that he is much more in earnest than any of his neighbours. He is always waking up himself or them. Nevertheless, if he would but forego his uneasy and ambitious earnestness, Mr. Brown possesses enough of talent, of genuine power, of spiritual sympathy, of real fervour, to be a truly impressive preacher. He has addicted himself to a bad school in theology, and also to a bad school in literary taste and style. He would do well to part company with Maurice and to study Howe and Barrow, Ellicott and Trench. He 'believes in the Holy Ghost.' He preaches a spiritual and a practical Gospel. He has abandoned Calvinism; let him beware of abandoning the evangelical theology of Baxter and Wardlaw. He has gone too far in this direction already; we are inclined to hope that he is retracing his steps.

The Negeb: or, 'South Country' of Scripture. By the Rev. Edward Wilton, M.A., Oxon. With a Map. London: Macmillan and Co. 1863.

MR. WILTON's well-written and well-printed little work is an interesting addition to the geography of the Holy Land, as well as a valuable contribution to that branch of Christian evidence which rests on the minute accuracy of Scripture in its minor details. It contains a thorough examination of a district often mentioned in the Bible, occurring in every enumeration of the natural divisions of Palestine, but which has hitherto received little attention from biblical geographers.

The *Negeb*, generally translated the 'South,' or 'South Country,' would be more accurately styled the 'Arid or Dry Country.' It occupies a central position between the 'great and terrible wilderness,' and the 'land flowing with milk and honey.' It is the country towards which Abram journeyed, (Gen. xii. 9,) and whither he went up out of Egypt; (Gen. xiii. 1;) where Isaac dwelt; (Gen. xxiv. 62;) and which the spies sent out by Moses found to be occupied by the Amalekites. Joshua enumerates its twenty-nine cities; (Joshua xv. 21-32;) most of which Mr. Wilton has satisfactorily identified.

Its physical and zoological characteristics are detailed by Isaiah in a single verse, (xxx. 6,) the accuracy of which, and of all other incidental allusions to this district, is most amply substantiated.

Mr. Wilton has evidently examined with the utmost care every work bearing on sacred geography, and almost every book of travel in the Holy Land,—not forgetting the itineraries of early pilgrims, and the chronicles of the Crusaders. He has thus been enabled most beautifully and clearly to reconcile some apparent contradictions—such as, the statements in Numbers xiv., which represent the Amalekites first as dwelling in a *valley*, (verse 25,) then on a *mountain*; (verses 40, 45;) whilst elsewhere the same country is called a *plain*. A few mistranslations in our Authorised Version are corrected. The critical remarks are always worthy of attention, and generally carry conviction with them. The volume, small as it is, bears everywhere the marks of years of patient toil, joined to reverent love for the word of God. We cordially recommend it to our readers; and sincerely trust that Mr. Wilton may be spared to carry out his intention of dealing in the same way with the other parts of the Holy Land, so as to give us (what is much needed) ‘a critical and exhaustive Treatise on the Physical and Historical Geography of Palestine.’

The First Week of Time: or, Scripture in Harmony with Science. By Charles Williams, Author of ‘Art in Nature,’ ‘The Seven Ages of England,’ &c. London: Jackson, Walford, and Hodder. 1863.

It is a pity that feeble and foolish writers should presume to undertake the deepest and most difficult problems; yet we suppose it is their folly which tempts them to the adventure. This is a well-intended book, written by a devout believer in the truth of God’s word, and put together with great care and painstaking; moreover it is published by a most respectable house—the well-known Nonconformist publishers, formerly of St. Paul’s Churchyard, now of ‘the Row.’ More than this we *cannot* say in its favour.

The Earnest Student: being Memorials of John Mackintosh. By Norman Macleod, D.D., &c. Popular Edition. London: Strahan and Co. 1863.

We have no need to characterize or to commend this favourite biography, which, after passing through ten editions in eight years, has now become the property of Mr. Strahan, and is published in the present edition, as one of the volumes of Strahan’s ‘Family Library,’ at little more than one half of the original price. We do not doubt that in this form its circulation will yet be much more widely extended. A better book for the intelligent young Christian, especially the Christian student, is not to be found. We would urge all young ministers and all candidates for the ministry

to procure it for themselves. It will help to make them not only more 'earnest students,' but nobler men, and more devout and spiritual Christians. We may not omit to note the rare generosity of Dr. Macleod, himself a leading minister of the Established Church of Scotland, in handing over from the beginning all the profits from the copyright of this biography to 'those missionary objects of the Free Church, the welfare of which John Mackintosh had so much at heart.' 'The book,' says the biographer in the same spirit, 'in everything which gives it any kind of value, belongs to him and not to me.'

The Gospel of the Pentateuch. A Set of Parish Sermons, by the Rev. C. Kingsley, F.L.S., F.G.S., &c. With a Preface. Published by Request. London: Parker, Son, and Bourn. 1863.

Most heartily do we welcome the present volume from the pen of Mr. Kingsley. Some of his later volumes of sermons have been poor. But here the writer of the *Village Sermons* appears in his strength. Better still, he appears to do battle for the historical truth of the Pentateuch, and especially of 'the supernatural element' in the biblical record. This fact is the more remarkable because of the common relationship both of Kingsley and of the 'bishop' against whose heresies this volume is directed to the school of Coleridge and Maurice. Kingsley and Maurice are in theology 'Siamese twins,' and are intimately acquainted and united. Colenso also has been intimately associated with Maurice; he was proud everywhere to call that earnest and benevolent mystagogue 'his guide, philosopher, and friend.' Mrs. Colenso, before her husband went to Natal, published a selection from Mr. Maurice's writings as a devotional companion to the Eucharist. (!) The bishop, in a volume of sermons, (we believe his first theological publication,) took the earliest opportunity, after his designation to his see, of publicly identifying himself with Mr. Maurice and his theology. His Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans is distinctly Maurician. In the colony and on his voyage back to this country he made Maurice's works his companions, if not his oracles. Now, however, his own development of his master's principles is signally rebuked by his master's friend and fellow-theologian, Professor Kingsley.

Any one who has read carefully Mr. Maurice's volumes on the 'Old Testament' and the 'Prophets and Kings' must have perceived in them an amount of laxity as to the strict historical accuracy of the Old Testament, and a determination, if possible and in a quiet way, to eliminate the predictive element of prophecy, from which nothing else was to be expected but that Mr. Maurice's disciples would be encouraged to go to such lengths as Bishop Colenso has actually attained. Moreover, the tendency of all Mr. Maurice's teaching, the plain doctrine of his sermon on the Bible, (as quoted in Rigg's *Modern Anglican Theology*, Second Edition, p. 213,) points to the

conclusion, that when the Bible has awakened in men the sense of a living Creator and Governor, it has done all, and whether a man understands its teaching further than this, is a matter of no great account; that when the Bible has led man to God, man can thenceforth get on without the Bible. But this is precisely the principle which pervades Bishop Colenso's destructive criticisms. He has therefore, in all that he has written, only shown himself too apt a disciple of his acknowledged master in theology.

We are bound to add that Mr. Kingsley also, whilst he has nowhere dealt lightly by the facts of the Old Testament, or shown less than a religious appreciation of its character as a sacred history, has in several of his writings appeared to reduce the inspiration of the Hebrew prophets to a level with that of heathen seers; and has more than intimated that proper foresight was not within their gift. (See *Modern Anglican Theology*, Second Edition, pp. 280, 281.)

Such being the state of the case, it is little wonder that the appearance of the Bishop of Natal's freethinking volume so disturbed Mr. Maurice as almost to drive him to resign his position as a clergyman. And it is eminently gratifying to find Mr. Kingsley coming forward with a volume which must be regarded as a wholesome manifesto, by one of the chiefs of the true Coleridgean school, against the 'left-handed' development of their doctrines by a too headlong disciple; a volume, indeed, which betokens a reactionary movement towards old-fashioned faith and orthodoxy of the most hopeful character on the part of the noblest and most gifted of the Neo-Platonizing school. The *National Review*—which has for the last twelve-months been the organ of the Rowland Williams coterie of advanced disbelievers within the Church of England—gives up all hope of Professor Kingsley, and makes no attempt to disguise the degree of its disappointment and disgust at his reactionary course. We, on the other hand, are profoundly thankful to note how the honest and reverent Christian sympathies of his nature are obtaining full mastery over the convictions of the author of *Yeast* and of *Hypatia*.

In his preface Mr. Kingsley expresses his faith and conviction, 'after much thought,' that 'not merely the moral, but the historic element' in the Bible is 'inspired and Divine;' and that therefore 'the value of the Bible teaching depends on the truth of the Bible story.' He proceeds as follows: 'If all that a man wants is a "religion," he ought to be able to make a very pretty one for himself, and a fresh one as often as he is tired of the old. But the heart and soul of man wants more than that, as it is written, "My soul is athirst for God, even for the living God."' 'In the power of man to find out God I will never believe. The "religious sentiment" seems to me a faculty not to be depended on; as fallible and corrupt as any other part of human nature.—The hearts and minds of the sick, the poor, the sorrowing, the truly human, all demand a living God in a word, demand the historic truth of the Bible—of the Old Testament no less than of the New.' He speaks, moreover, of the bishop of Natal's book as one which 'claims and exercises a licence in cri-

ticism, which I must (after careful study of it) call anything but rational and reverent.'

In accordance with this preface is the teaching of the volume. Nothing can be bolder or more thorough than the Professor's defence of the most remarkable miracles contained in the Pentateuch; nothing can be more happy or more simply and piercingly profound and conclusive than his rebukes of the shallowness, the presumption, the unreasonableness, of those who reject miracles, merely as such; (and in this part of his work his own scientific accomplishments as a naturalist stand him in good stead;) nothing can be finer than his exposition of the moral fitness and meaning of the miracles of which he speaks; and as the sermons were preached to a village audience, they are in that style of inimitably clear and home-coming English, which is one of Mr. Kingsley's greatest gifts.

Mr. Kingsley addresses this Preface to Dr. Stanley, and makes much of his obligations to Dr. Stanley's volume of lectures on the *Jewish History*. We are happy, however, to say that Mr. Kingsley's own teaching is much bolder and more satisfactory than that of his subtle and accomplished friend and fellow-chaplain. Of course—we need hardly add,—his peculiar evangel comes here and there to the surface. This, however, is only incidentally, and not often. The special features and the general scope of this volume are such as to make it a really valuable and a very seasonable publication. Whatever be Mr. Kingsley's defects or errors, he is a powerful anti-naturalist: he will never coalesce with the school of Rowland Williams.

History of the Church of Christ: with a Special View to the Delineation of Christian Faith and Life. From A.D. 1 to A.D. 313. By the Rev. Islay Burns, M.A. London: Nelson and Sons. 1862.

WE should have earlier noticed this charming volume. For such a work there was evidently an opening; and no one could have been thought of to whom the task would be more congenial than Mr. Burns. This is a volume for young people and students; but it is one which all intellects and ages will read with advantage. The style is clear and spirited; always chaste and often eloquent. After an Introduction, relating to the world before Christ, the history is divided into two portions, 'The Apostolic Church,' and 'The Martyr Church.' The history ends with the inauguration of the reign of Constantine. The best authorities have been consulted, and an admirable candour and catholicity of spirit has lighted the author to the discernment of the truth. A considerable portion of the volume consists of an Appendix, containing extracts from authors of high repute respecting important points which it did not suit Mr. Burns' plan to discuss on his own account and in the text.

The Forty Days after our Lord's Resurrection. By the Rev. William Hanna, LL.D., Author of 'the Last Day of our Lord's Passion.' Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas. 1863.

It is just twelve months since we gave our judgment of Dr. Hanna's work on the *Last Day of our Lord's Passion* in terms of high commendation, presuming at the same time to differ on one or two points of exposition with the author. We are exceedingly happy to hail another work of a similar character—a continuation indeed of the former—from the pen of the same accomplished expositor. As the volume, however, has only come into our hands at a late hour of the quarter, we cannot do more than say that, having read it in part, we find it characterized in general by the same qualities which made the former work so attractive. The subject of the volume is one of the deepest interest.

The Intellectual Observer: a Review of Natural History, Microscopic Research, and Recreative Science. Vols. III. and IV. London: Groombridge and Sons.

THIS publication fully retains its interest; and besides a large number of pleasant, readable papers, these volumes contain several that are of permanent value, and that deserve careful study. The contents range over a wide surface, and it is a pity if the gleanings from so many fields do not furnish something that will suit even the most fastidious reader. Mr. Thomas Wright caters for the antiquarians, Mr. Webb for the astronomers, Mr. Gosse, Dr. Lawson, Mr. Couch, and many others, for the naturalists, Mr. Slack for the microscopists, Mr. Campbell for the botanists, and so on. There are six or eight coloured plates in each volume, besides occasional diagrams and woodcuts, all very respectably executed. Several descriptions of botanical rambles show the young student what to seek, and where to find what he is seeking. Of the same practical character are two articles on the anatomy of the Slug, by Dr. Lawson, which describe the actual *modus operandi* of dissection in the case of this mollusc, and give the plainest directions for laying open the several organs. Those who have stumbled against, and not always over, the difficulties which lie in the way of self-taught workers in this department, will appreciate the boon of such instruction as is here given, and will hope for similar articles on the dissection of other invertebrate animals. Could not Dr. Cobbold, who is an occasional contributor, do the same good office for the *Entozoa*, or, better still, some of the *Annelida*? Another feature is a *résumé* of the arguments of several important books; as for instance, Huxley on *Man's Place in Nature*, Lyell on the *Antiquity of Man*, and Admiral Fitzroy on *The Weather*. Occasionally, there are translations of foreign scientific articles, as the valuable one of Pasteur on *Putrefaction*, which was some little time ago read before the French Academy. Pasteur propounds the theory

that certain infusoria which always accompany putrescent matter, are not the results, but the *agents*, of putrefaction, that they are, in fact, animal ferments; and, among other curious facts, he states that they not only do not require oxygen for the support of life, but that contact with oxygen *deprives* them of life. This paper has attracted much attention both in France and in this country, and has raised a very animated discussion. Some of the later phases of the controversy are noticed toward the close of the fourth volume. When, in addition to all this, we have a series of miscellaneous and brief references to the proceedings of the learned Societies, wherever the learned Societies are good enough to come down to the everyday level,—we have the main features of a scientific magazine which has attained a large share of popularity, and most justly deserves its success. We recommend the *Intellectual Observer* to the attention of our readers, only regretting, in spite of a famous dictum, that it is not more fortunate in its name.

Newcastle Daily Chronicle. Report of the Thirty-third Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science. Newcastle-on-Tyne. 1863.

Reports of the Meeting of the British Association as given in the 'Northern Daily Express.' Newcastle-upon-Tyne. August 27th to September 4th. 1863.

IF the late Meeting of the British Association in Newcastle is not destined to become an epoch in scientific discovery, it will yet hold an honourable place in the series of festivals to which it belongs. The muster of *savans* was large and brilliant. The Northern metropolis did itself credit by the splendour of its hospitalities. The coal-owners and manufacturers of the district threw open to their visitors without reserve the mysteries of their wealth-making. The exhibitions, both public and private, attracted much attention. The *soirées* were delightful. The lectures by Professor Williamson and Mr. Glaisher drew eager crowds of listeners. The excursions, where the weather was not ruthlessly hostile, gave general content. The appearances of the President, Sir William Armstrong, were all in keeping with the dignity and eloquence of his inaugural address. The sections were generally well attended, not unfrequently thronged; and many most valuable communications were read and discussed in them. Last, not least, the money proceeds of the Meeting were so ample as to enable the Association to make numerous and, in some cases, very liberal grants towards various scientific objects which it seeks from year to year to aid and promote. The papers in the Mathematical Section were on the whole of a more popular cast than usual; the subjects of Spectrum Analysis, of Meteors, of the Invisibility of Light, of the Phenomena of Sound, and others akin to them, occupying considerable space in its proceedings, and attracting audiences for which purely technical inquiries could have little charm. The Chemical Section devoted much of its time to the manufactures of Newcastle and the Tyne, particularly alkali, glass,

and copper; but important papers were read on topics of more general interest; and all along this Section showed great life and spirit. The Zoology and Botany Section ranged as of old over a wide area of topics, exhibiting perhaps a growing disposition to deal with such as bear directly upon the safety and well-being of man. It was a material assistance to the business of this department, that, on the suggestion of Sir Roderick Murchison, a Sub-Section was formed for the department of Physiology; and we hope this arrangement will be followed at future meetings of the Association. As was likely within cannon-shot of Elswick, the Mechanical Section showed great activity; and what with gun-cotton, boiler-explosions, iron-shipbuilding, and the like, its hands were kept well filled; nor shall we marvel, if we hear something more by and by of the conversations which were held under the sensible guidance of its chairman, Professor Willis. The Social Science Section made further addition in Newcastle to the ground which it had previously gained in public estimation. The papers on the Gold Currency, on the Indian Army, on Criminal Reformation, on the Volunteer Movement, and many others, were worthy of the intelligence and philanthropy of the Section; and it was not a little satisfactory to observe how marked attention was paid to its proceedings, both within doors and without.

The Sections most in the ascendant, however, throughout the Meeting, were those devoted to Geological Science and to Geography and Ethnology. In the former of these the discussions on the famous gravel deposits of the valley of the Somme brought up of necessity the question of the antiquity of man; and in more than one instance the same great subject came under consideration in the Ethnological Section, when papers were read having any bearing upon it. The presence of Sir Charles Lyell was not likely to lessen the interest which this leading topic excited; and as matter of fact it was *the* point in which the scientific curiosity and feeling of the Meeting culminated. It seemed to be generally agreed that if the testimony of recent geological discoveries was not to be suppressed or garbled, the period of the human race must be put back considerably beyond the limits of our common chronology. As to this, no difference of opinion was expressed among the practical men of the Meeting. At the same time a wise reserve was shown, and by no one more than by Sir Charles Lyell himself, in reference to any attempt to fix the date of the appearance of man on the globe, or to harmonize the new scientific conclusion with the records of sacred and profane history. On the general question of the relations between Divine Revelation and the scientific discoveries which appear to infringe upon it, Professor Wilson of Toronto spoke with great judgment and power; and if we may gather an opinion as to the prevailing sentiment of the Meeting from the applause with which his observations were received, we cannot doubt that the inspiration of Moses stands just where it did, the phenomena of the bone caves and flint-implement beds notwithstanding, in the conviction of the bulk of its members.

In the Ethnological Section two other subjects attracted scarcely less attention than the antiquity of man; namely, the Discovery of the Sources of the Nile, of which an interesting account was given, in the absence of Captain Speke, by his heroic companion Captain Grant; and the supposed Inferiority of the Negro Race of Mankind, as maintained by Dr. Hunt and Mr. Blake. These gentlemen of the Anthropological Society, in utter oblivion of the fact that the two great characteristics of humanity, the capacity of religion and the faculty of rational speech, are found as truly and fully in the negro as in any other scion of our species, contended that the formation of the negro's heel and some other minute features of his physiology relegate him to an inferior type of creation. The disfavour with which these doctrines were received will not soon be forgotten by their advocates; and we trust the discipline to which they were subjected will have the effect of clarifying their intellectual eyesight, and of saving them from the like ignominy in future years. As usual, this same Section was tormented with the dogmatism and petty jokes of the octogenarian Mr. Crawford; but we were glad to remark the absence for the most part of the profanity and coarseness by which he disgusted the Section at the Manchester Meeting of 1861. Even in Newcastle we were thankful in more than one instance that no lady of our acquaintance or little child was sitting by us when Mr. Crawford was speaking; but on the whole there was a great change for the better as compared with the year we speak of. The propriety of the rule which forbids the admission of technical theology into the discussions of the British Association is sufficiently obvious. But religion and public decency may surely claim to be respected within its borders. And we earnestly hope that the Presidents of Sections will keep their eye upon this, and for the sake of the Association itself, and the great ends which it contemplates, will frown down whatever is incompatible with the purity and devoutness of true science. One feature of the Newcastle Meeting of the Association called forth warm and well-merited eulogy from its members. The newspaper reports were of unexampled extent and excellence. The *Newcastle Chronicle* has since published the numbers which it issued during the Meeting in a separate form and at a low price; and the *Northern Express*, though it has not imitated the example of its contemporary in this respect, was hardly inferior to it in the accuracy and fulness with which it described the proceedings of the assembly. Altogether the Newcastle Meeting of the Association has been a good and successful one; and the general result must be highly advantageous to the commonwealth of letters and mankind.

On Matter and Ether; or, The Secret Laws of Physical Change.
By Thomas Rawson Birks, M.A. Cambridge and London: Macmillan and Co. 1862.

THIS is eminently a book for the natural philosopher. It pro-

pounds a hypothesis to account for all forms of matter, and all physical phenomena, by the assumption of two forms of substance. Theories similar, but less comprehensive in their aim, and differing in their details, have previously been constructed; and those of Boscovich and Mosotti are mentioned and criticised by Mr. Birks.

In the present work, the steps of reasoning in the construction of the theory are very clearly laid down; and the first result is the conception of matter as consisting of mathematical points that are centres of an attractive force varying inversely as the square of the distance. This hypothesis, however, is insufficient to account for the phenomena of cohesion and light; and the existence of an elastic ether is assumed. It is shown that the particles of ether and matter must be mutually attractive, with a force varying (probably) as the Inverse Sixth; and that the particles of ether must be mutually repulsive, with a force varying (probably) as the Inverse Twelfth. Every atom of matter is inseparably joined to a monad of ether, and of these 'dual monads' or 'material atoms' all material bodies are composed; free ether, however, possibly existing in the interstices even of the heavier solids. What are called in the ordinary language of chemistry 'elements,' are in Mr. Birks's theory supposed to be really compounds, and formed by special arrangements of the primary 'material atoms,' which are probably hydrogen. The phenomena of light, heat, magnetism, electricity, &c., are explained by various modes of atomic vibration, oscillation, rotation, centrifugal force, and variation of the mean *vis viva* of ethereal repulsion.

We have here given some of the principal points of the theory; but it must not be supposed that these are all arbitrary assumptions. On the contrary, the theory is, for the most part, constructed with great caution, and is tested by a very wide application to the facts of science. One assertion, however, is startling, and seems to be insufficiently based. The amount of ethereal pressure is calculated to be about eighteen billions of pounds to the square inch. It is said that 'when two media are compared, the velocity of a vibration varies as the square root of the pressure, or modulus of the elasticity.' Then, from a comparison of the velocities of light and sound, the ethereal pressure is deduced to be 1,224,037,000,000 times greater than that of atmospheric air. But where all the media which can be compared in the manner required, differ so essentially from ether as, by Mr. Birks's hypothesis, they must do, it does not seem that any conclusion inferred from such a comparison can be at all applicable to ether. If this objection be valid, it will of course affect all parts of the theory which involve this estimate of ethereal pressure.

As Mr. Birks's hypothesis is nothing less than a theory of the universe, we cannot, with the fate of so many less ambitious, but scarcely less ingenious, hypotheses before us, guess what may befall it, when subjected to that minute and extended scrutiny which all theories must and do receive before they can be finally accepted as sound doctrine. We think if his own applications of the theory had

been less numerous, and their quantitative relations more exactly ascertained, the result would have been more satisfactory.

A great part of the book will scarcely be intelligible to those who have not some familiarity with physico-mathematical speculations. This is a difficulty which it must be regretted has not been partially met by the introduction of woodcuts. But even to the general reader there is much that is highly interesting. Apart from the ingenuity of the speculations themselves, some of the later discoveries are put in a new and striking point of view. The condition of the highest stratum of the atmosphere, and its possible connexion with tropical thunderstorms, and the northern lights; the nature of the tails of comets; the relations of light and radiant heat; the causes of colour-blindness; a very beautiful and exact analogy (which we can only here allude to) between the principal colours of the spectrum, and the most important musical intervals;—these and many other similar subjects are discussed in a way that cannot but prove interesting as well as highly instructive.

Though the result of long-continued thought and patient inquiry, the book is modestly offered as an 'essay;' and we shall be glad to see a fuller development of the theory from the hands of its author.

A Dictionary of Natural History Terms, with their Derivations, including the various Orders, Genera, and Species
By David H. M'Nicoll, M.D. London: Lovell Reeve and Co. 1863.

To the young student of Natural History this volume will be a useful and valuable guide. The nomenclature of science is unfortunately so very arbitrary and inconstant, that no rules can be laid down for its interpretation, as the contents of this book sufficiently testify. The fancied significance or resemblance, according to which the subject is named, often exists only in the imagination of the nomenclator, or at any rate requires to be distinctly pointed out before it is seen by others. Or the allusion may be still more slight and unlooked for. Dr. M'Nicoll gives as an instance *Ipomæa cataractæ*, which was so named by Bauer from a place in Norfolk Island called 'The Cascade.' *Theridion carolinum*, a species of spider, was named by Baron Walekenæer after his second son Charles, the discoverer. And Dr. Selater affirms that *Tanager labradorides* was so named to signify that its plumage shone like Labrador spar! These are, of course, extreme cases; but even as a rule the compound name does not always yield up its meaning, however closely interrogated. Thus *Lophohelia prolifera*, a British coral, derives its generic name from *λοφος*, 'a tuft,' *ἥλιος*, 'the sun;' i. e., 'a tuft of suns;' which, as far as the living coral is concerned, might well perplex the student, (should he be lucky enough to come across it,) but is quite intelligible when referred to the radiating plates of the stony skeleton. So with *Glyphisia*, from *γλυφίς*, 'the notch in an arrow,' which needs the further reference to the lunate mark on the wing of the insect. And again, the botanical name *Collomia*, from *κόλλα*, 'glue,'

which is given not from any peculiarity in the plant itself, but from the glutinous covering of the seeds. Such explanations are frequent, and will be very serviceable.

Something like 15,000 terms are here furnished, with the pronunciation and the derivation of each, the proper names also being generally traced up to their origin. The most casual glance, however, at these pages is sufficient to show that the principle first propounded by Linnæus of honouring patrons, and friends, and scientific men generally, by appending their names to new discoveries, has proved to be a mistake. Something like one fifth of the entire list consists of proper names. Out of twenty-three names on one page, no less than seventeen are taken from botanists, travellers, and others, as Knappia, Knightia, Knoxia, Knowltonia, Koenigia,—men of whom contemporaries very properly speak with respect, but most of whose names posterity will very willingly let die, or would do if it might. All languages are of course represented in the list; but the French names, perhaps, bear Latinising the least successfully of any. Vieusseuxia is worse than O'Neillia, worse than Hodgsoni, and Hoffmannseggia, or even than the illustrious Messersmidtia. One would like to know the precise claims of Herr Hof-und-Stadt-Kantor Messing, of Neustrelitz, permanently to saddle Entomology with his name. There is, however, no room for Englishmen to say a word against any such intruders, seeing that a countryman of theirs has thought fit to introduce a name into the botanical list quite as barbarous as any there,—Uroskinnera; given in honour of Mr. Ure Skinner, and thus defended by Dr. Lindley:—'We trust that verbal pedants will not quarrel with the manner in which we have contrived to escape from the difficulty of there being already a Skinnera in the botanical field, but agree with us, that Ure Skinner may be fairly blended into a name which shall unmistakeably record the labours of one who ought to compete with any other Skinner whatever.' We do *not* agree, either as regards the mode or the necessity, and of course are 'verbal pedants' accordingly.

There are other curious items which the reader will discover for himself. We have only to add that the book is an excellent specimen of typography, even in these fastidious days, and that it is in all respects handsomely got up.

A Digest of the Laws and Regulations of the Australasian Wesleyan Connexion. By Charles W. Rigg, Wesleyan Minister. Sydney: Published by Stephen Rabone, Wesleyan Book Depot. 1863.

For years past the British Wesleyan Conference has had before it, and indeed has been pledged to accomplish, the work of arranging and consolidating into a 'Manual' the various laws and regulations by which the Wesleyan Church is governed and its affairs are administered. But such a work, when intrusted to a Committee, and when designed to be exhaustive, perfect, and authoritative, must be expected to be very long in forthcoming, however pressing may

be felt to be its necessity. The work now under our notice has been performed on his own responsibility, though with the good-will of his brethren, by the Rev. C. W. Rigg, of Paramatta. It is at once comprehensive and portable, and will be found almost as useful for Wesleyan Ministers at home, as for their Australasian brethren. 'The Minutes of the British Conference up to 1854 are received by the Australasian Conference as binding upon it, so far as doctrinal and disciplinary principles are concerned.' There is, accordingly, very little of the British Conference legislation down to 1854 of which a good digest will not be found in this volume. And much of the subsequent legislation of the British Conference is also incorporated. Grindrod's *Compendium* has long been obsolete. Pierce's volume (published in 1854) is scarce and bulky. The present volume is not only modern, but cheap and convenient. The fact that it contains the specific legislation of the Australasian Conference during the nine years which have elapsed since that Conference was formed and affiliated on the British Conference, renders this compendium additionally interesting and instructive.

Better Days for Working People. By the Rev. W. G. Blaikie, M.A., Edinburgh. London: Strahan and Co. 1863.

HERE is a wonderfully cheap eighteen-pennyworth of excellent sense for the benefit of working people. The very advanced age of Lord Brougham has but little abated either his power of saying good things, or his tendency to say rash things. Not a few rash and unwise words did he utter at Edinburgh; but among the true and timely things which he said, was his public and emphatic commendation of this volume. We can only hope that those for whose benefit it has been prepared will take his lordship's advice, and read the book with due attention.

Mr. Blaikie shows in how many respects the condition of the working classes has been ameliorated, and how exceedingly fortunate is the position of the operative who is at the same time skilled, generally well informed, and morally well conducted. There is certainly no country in the world, not even the United States, where such operatives may be so happy as in England. But the great difficulty, as Mr. Blaikie clearly sees, is how to bring into this superior position the vast masses of workpeople who, though they may be skilled labourers, are neither generally well informed, nor morally educated and well conducted. At present this forms by far the largest class of British operatives; and for these as yet all our educational appliances and all our enlightened legislation have effected comparatively little. Mr. Blaikie clearly sees that at the root of this problem lies the question of 'houses *versus* hovels,' which forms the subject of one of his chapters. And he has attained to the right conclusion respecting it. 'To make the problem soluble, the element of rent must be eliminated entirely.

Term-day must cease to have any terrors for the working man. The dreaded visit of the landlord demanding his money must become a thing of the past. The old Hebrew Arcadia must be brought back, when every man sat under his vine and under his fig-tree, none making him afraid.....The working man must get quit of the landlord by becoming the landlord himself. He must do all over the country, what has been done so well at Birmingham and other places, invest his own savings in his own house. Let him do this, either with money accumulated in his earlier years, according to the plan which we have been urging so strongly, or by means of the assistance which Investment Societies are willing to give him.'

There can be no doubt that this and this only must be the solution of 'the problem of houses for the working classes.' Years ago, in an article on the *Character and Condition of the English Poor*, the same conclusion was demonstrated in this journal. In the same article, also, we gave our reasons for regarding Co-operative Associations as in the very best sense educational institutions for the working classes, and as affording the most beneficial link of connexion and transition between the class of operatives and that of masters. We are glad to find that on this point also Mr. Blaikie has reached the same conclusion as ourselves.

But why has Mr. Blaikie taken no notice whatever of the case of the peasantry of England and Scotland? Theirs is the problem. As respects the classes of artisans and skilled operatives Mr. Blaikie's book will but help forward a movement already well begun, and the issues of which, though still distant, are yet within sight. But as respects the peasantry of Britain the public mind of the kingdom is as yet almost destitute of true ideas or of worthy Christian conceptions. What Mr. Cobden said at Rochdale respecting the peasantry of this country is but too true, as all must know who have thought it worth their while earnestly to investigate the condition of so large and important a class of their fellow-countrymen. There cannot be a more perniciously false picture than that which has been sometimes drawn of the health, innocence, and comfort of the agricultural population of Great Britain. The facts of the case present a distressing contrast to such dainty dreams. If the lovers of the country would but so far truly love the country people, as to inquire how they live, what are their hopes and prospects, and how or where they expect to die, and would but ask themselves what is the lowest condition of comfort, hopefulness, and power of self-help which a 'free-born Englishman' should enjoy, there would be some likelihood of things being altered for the better. But so long as the middle classes of Britain are the freest and most prosperous in the world, so long as justice is done to the crowded masses of our operative population, who know how to make their demands heard, and so long as the gentle and high-born of this land continue to regard the present condition of the peasantry as natural and inevitable, and as one in regard to which their only duty is to alleviate it as far as may be by charity and condescending

sympathy as towards an essentially inferior and permanently dependent race;—so long there is little likelihood of anything effectual being done to lift into true liberty and into manly hopefulness and self-reliance the peasantry of our land. Meantime their condition is well understood by foreigners, and is the one opprobrium of our country, among the philanthropists and public men of the Continent and of America.

While we are writing these lines, there comes to hand an American religious journal, of very wide circulation, which contains in a prominent place on its first page an extract, headed 'English Agricultural Labourers,' taken from the Manual of Political Economy lately published by Mr. Henry Fawcett, the newly elected Professor of Political Economy in the University of Cambridge. In this passage Mr. Fawcett states that 'there are few classes of workmen who, in many respects, are so thoroughly wretched as the English agricultural labourers.....Throughout a large agricultural district, with which we are intimately acquainted, we know that the great majority of the agricultural labourers have not saved a single penny; to them a life of toilsome and incessant industry can offer no other prospect but to drag out a miserable old age; for then they will either be paupers in the workhouse, or they must come as suppliant mendicants for parish relief. But even the physical suffering which is associated with their poverty is not the worst feature of their condition; their ignorance is as complete as it is distressing.' And what their social condition and domestic habits must be, those who have studied the subject will understand from the character of the hovels in which they live, the wretchedness of which is, autumn after autumn, exposed in the columns of the daily press, but remains for the most part unmitigated, notwithstanding the pleadings and invective of S.G.O., and the outcries of the press. It is well known to be the personal and pecuniary interest of the landlords that the cottages should be as few and as poor as possible. Comfortable and creditable cottages do not pay an adequate money return. How can they when labourers earn nine or ten shillings a week? Moreover, many landlords make it a rule to pull down all the cottages on their estates in order to avoid the charge of poor-rates, and the labourer has to walk three, five, or even eight miles to the scene of his daily toil. Can anything be more iniquitous, more infamous, than such a condition of things as this? And yet the very paper the columns of which teem year by year with heart-harrowing evidence of all that we have now stated, and more than all, refuses to open its eyes to the fact that here there must be some great and fundamental wrong; and appears to maintain that nothing more can be done for the peasantry of England than has been done. The peasantry teem upon the land; but the present state of the laws affecting land shuts them out from purchasing a rood of it. Meantime there is no law which compels either the farmer who employs them, or the landlord who is said to 'own' the land, who does enjoy the usufruct of it, to

provide them with habitations. They wander far and wide to find wretched cottages, and there they are too often compelled to litter together like swine. For all this there is but one remedy. Mere public opinion, it is evident, is utterly ineffectual. The rights of the son of the soil must be fully conceded to the labourer. Hitherto, while nominally a freeman, he has been actually little other than a serf, without the provisions and immunities which belong to serfs. The labourer must be put into a position to help himself; he must no longer be regarded as only made to be helped by the hand of high-placed charity, or lodged and kept alive, as one of a quasi-criminal class, by the cold and suspicious bounty of the state. The one cure for the pauperised and brutalised condition of the agricultural labourer is identical with that which Mr. Blaikie has discovered to be the remedy for the evils which still attach to the general condition of the operative classes. The peasant must be enabled to become his own landlord. Every labouring man who has attained to the age of twenty-one, and has laboured for a given time on the same farm, ought, under certain conditions, and within a certain distance of the homestead where he finds his labour, to be entitled to purchase a rood of land at the market price.* It is idle to talk of difficulties in the way of accomplishing this. All difficulties must give way where the morals, the manliness, the human rights of our fellow-men are concerned. Have not all difficulties and all scruples, whether of feudal landlords or of others, been made to give place in the line of railroads? And is the character of the peasantry of England, and of England itself, a matter of less importance? The Bill which has been carried, through the energy of the present Chancellor, to provide for the gradual introduction of a system of land registry, is an important step in the right direction; as it will simplify and assure titles, and, so far as it obtains, will reduce the cost of conveyance to a mere trifle. Even the poor ploughboy, if he were temperate and thrifty, could, by the help of the Post Office Savings Bank, save at least £50 by the time he was twenty-five years of age. But what he wants is a motive. Give him a hope of buying half an acre or even a rood of land on which he could work as his own garden, and in which he could hope to place his own house, and for this he would toil and save and even put off marriage. Once let him get a roof of his own over his head, and his fear of the poor-house is at an end. This is no mere theory. It has been proved true by the experience of the Swiss cantons, of

* A law enabling owners of land, notwithstanding their settlements, to sell in the given case a rood of land to a resident labourer, would probably be sufficient. Such labourers would give the very best prices for land. And such a quantity of land would not materially or perceptibly detract from the bulk and integrity of the estate. Labourers' gardens and creditable cottages erected upon them would be the greatest ornament of an estate. All that is needed is to help the labourer to get into a position in which he is above pauperism, to enable him to set his foot upon the first rung of the ladder of social elevation. He and his order may then be left to work out their own advance and improvement. There is no need to interfere materially with the law of entail or at all with that of primogeniture.

many parts of Germany, and of our own Channel Islands. The landlord's poor-rates will no doubt be in proportion to the number of *his* cottages. But if the cottages come to be owned by the labouring men themselves, and if clever and saving young men might have the reasonable expectation, after a few years of steady labour, of becoming themselves possessed of their own cottage homes, surrounded by their own gardens, pauperism as an institution would be extinguished, drunkenness would be greatly diminished, morals would be elevated, the peasant would become a free man. Then, as his family increased, the labourer would increase the accommodation of his cottage; then his home might be a place of family purity and happiness. Now it is too often a wretched and polluting double cell, where misery cowers, and where chastity and decency can scarcely be known. Till then the peasant will remain not England's glory, but her disgrace,—the nursling of the parish, the dependent of the squire;—brought into the world by the parish doctor, pensioned on parish pay, buried in the parish coffin,—dependent on the squire's will for such shelter as his poor cottage affords, precluded from becoming himself the owner of a yard of land, and prohibited, even when he might be willing, from adding anything to his house which might render it a decent home for his sons and daughters, or fit for a Christian's habitation. The middle classes of this country have won the battle of free trade for themselves; and in commercial legislation we are before the world. The next great victory will be the social (not the political) enfranchisement of the peasantry of England. Here we are behind the world. Our political economists have long been preaching the truth as to this most vital question; but class prejudices are rampant, and the truth can only get a hearing from a few. But the day must come when the science of J. S. Mill and the facts of Laing and Kay will prevail.*

* Since the above was written the Editor of the *Times*, in *proprio personâ*, has uttered his dictum upon this question of the peasantry and the land. In a correspondence which may possibly become historic, Mr. John T. Delane affirms that, whatever legal reforms may be effected, nothing can make land 'a profitable investment' for the poor man. Mr. J. T. Delane, if he is to answer, as he appears quite prepared to do, for the errors of the *Times*, has made many mistakes, indeed has been very commonly wrong (*at first*) upon public questions of the most profound and momentous character. But never has he made a greater mistake than upon this question. There is no investment so profitable to the poor agricultural labourer as a portion of land not too large to be well tilled by himself and his family, without foreign aid. It pays directly and to begin with as land can pay no one else. But it yields a further and yet higher profit, in its moral and educational influence on himself and his family. It keeps him and his sons out of the alchouse. It interests and employs all the family, winter and summer. It gives the happy sense of proprietorship, the genuine feeling of home. It elevates them all. It is a wonderful incentive to economy. Moreover it enables him after a while, if not at first, to become the owner of his own cottage. It is really impossible to overestimate the profitability of such an investment. It would be well if Mr. Delane and the writers he employs wrote less from prejudice and more from study and conviction; less to reflect the current opinions of their meridian of observation and intercourse, and more from a noble devotion to the cause, the holy cause, of pure righteousness and God's own eternal truth.

. *An Index for Vol. XXI. will be given with our next No.*

INDEX TO VOL. XXI.

- Abelard*, the forerunner of modern scepticism, 139
- About's* 'Madelon,' reviewed, 175
- Andrews's* 'Life of our Lord,' noticed, 525
- Autobiographies*, value of, 3
- Balme's* 'American States, Churches, and Slavery,' noticed, 531
- Baly*, Dr., his indulgence to sick prisoners reprehended, 274, 278, 290
- Barter*, his belief in witchcraft, 27—letters addressed to, by Howe, 366, *et seq.*
- Birks' Matter and Ether*, noticed, 546
- Blaikie's* 'Better Days for Working People,' noticed, 550
- British Association*, recent Meeting of, in Newcastle, 544
- Brameld's* 'Holy Gospels,' noticed, 536
- Brown's* 'Divine Mystery of Peace,' noticed, 537
- Browne's* 'Waitara Dispute,' reviewed, 437
- Bungener's* 'Trois Jours de la Vie d'un Père,' reviewed, 185
- Burns'* 'History of the Church of Christ,' noticed, 542
- Calderon's*, Madame, 'Life in Mexico,' reviewed, 387
- Calvin*, D'Aubigné's description of the work he came to do, 188
- Campbell's* 'Life Unfolding,' noticed, 533
- Carey's* 'Narrative of the late War in New Zealand,' reviewed, 437
- 'Case of the Rev. W. Long and the Bishop of Cape-Town,' reviewed, 189
- Castlereagh*, Lord, and the Poles, 72
- Chateaubriand*, notices of, 166
- Chevalier's* 'Mexique ancien et moderne,' reviewed, 170
- Clifford*, Sir C., quoted, in defence of Sir George Grey, 443
- Coleridge*, quoted, on zoo-magnetism, 52—on the reality of faith, 66
- '*Cornehill Magazine*,' strictures on the, 46
- Cricket*, a Frenchman's view of, 535
- Cromwell*, notices of, 365, *et seq.*
- Crowe*, Mrs., ghost stories by, 62, 63
- '*Customs of the Dissenters*,' noticed, 535
- D'Aubigné's* 'Histoire de la Réformation en Europe au Temps de Calvin,' reviewed, 185
- De Quincey*, quoted, on the metaphysical terminology of Kant, 427
- Dollinger's* 'Gentile and Jew in the Courts of the Temple of Christ,' noticed, 522
- Ebrard's* 'Gospel History,' noticed, 523
- Elizabeth*, Queen, described by De Maisse, 180
- Farrar's* Bampton Lecture, reviewed, 127—importance of the subject, 127—defects and excellencies of the work, 129, 158—causes of scepticism, 130—the problem stated, 132—Milton, Pope, and Tennyson, 134—the ages of faith, 135—crises of free thought, 139—infidelity of the Renaissance, 140—revived paganism, 142—Popery, 143—rise of modern infidelity, 144—pantheism, 148—German pantheism and French atheism, 151—modern German theology, 153—recent history of free thought in England and America, 154—lessons from the work, 157
- Ferry's* 'Vagabond Life in Mexico,' reviewed, 387
- French literature*, recent, reviewed, 161, *et seq.*
- 'From the World to the Pulpit,' noticed, 537
- '*Funeral Services on the Death of the Rev. W. Crook*,' noticed, 532
- Gage*, Father, in Mexico, 397, 415
- General Post Office*: postal history, 209—strange consignments, 213—postal reforms, 213—Rowland Hill's new régime, 214—progress in the year 1862, 215—newspapers and book packets, 217—registered letters, 219—popular carelessness, 221—the 'blind officers,' 223—money orders, 224—Post Office savings' banks, 227—foreign and colonial posts, 230—the packet service, 230—revenue of 1862, 234—the postman, 234
- Goethe*, quoted, 10, 13
- Greenhill's* 'Exposition of the Prophet Ezekiel,' noticed, 528
- Guardian*, quoted, in defence of Sir G. Grey, 442
- Guizot's* 'Histoire Parlementaire de France,' reviewed, 168
- H—'s* 'Imagine,' noticed, 532
- Hadfield's* 'One of England's little Wars,' reviewed, 437
- Hall*, Bishop, quoted, on witches, 27
- Hanna's* 'Forty Days after our Lord's Resurrection,' noticed, 543
- Hannam's* 'Pulpit Assistant,' noticed, 530
- '*Heaven our Home*,' reviewed, 328
- Heaven*, recent works on, reviewed, 328—loftiness of the subject, 328—'Heaven our Home,' 329—fabricated dialogues: Adam and Eve, 329; Jacob and Rachel, 330, 331; David and Jonathan, 330—

- recognition of friends, 331, 346—'Meet for Heaven,' 333, 338—a state of grace, 333—strange theology, 336, 355—translation of Enoch, 339—'analogies,' 340—'Life in Heaven,' 341—death scenes, 343—social intercourse illustrated, 347—pet phrases and figures, 348—specimens, 350—impertinence and dogmatism, 353
- Herschel's* definition of science, 420—quoted, 431
- Home*, Mr., notices of, as a Spiritualist, 38, 39, 44, 47, 49, 50, 69, 70
- Hood*, Thomas, Works of, reviewed, 90—the character of his genius, 90—his birth, 93—school days, 94—marriage, 95—early productions, 96—troubles, and voluntary exile, 96—return to England, 98—becomes editor of the 'New Monthly,' 99—'Hood's Magazine,' 100—'Lay of the Labourer,' and letter to Sir James Graham, 100—death, 105—his politics, 105—religion, 106—minor poems, 108—'Icyus the Centaur,' 110—'Plea of the Midsummer Fairies,' 111—'Lamia,' and 'Dream of Eugene Aram,' 112—'Song of the Shirt,' 113—'Pauper's Christmas Carol,' 'Workhouse Clock,' 'Lady's Dream,' and 'Bridge of Sighs,' 114—'Miss Kilmansegg,' 116—'Tynney Hall,' 119—'Up the Rhine,' 121—'Copyright and Copy-right,' 122—'The Friend in Need,' 123—comic works, 125
- Howe*, John, Rogers's edition of, 356—birth, 357—at the universities, 358—at Great Torrington, 359—a Puritan fast day, 360—as a preacher, 362—becomes chaplain to Cromwell, 365—return to Torrington, 369—becomes chaplain to Lord Massarene, 371—the 'Living Temple,' 371, 373, 383—removal to London, 373—Stillingfleet and Tillotson, 375—persecution, 376—settles in Utrecht, 378—the Revolution, 379—Trinitarian controversy, 381—'occasional conformity,' 382—his death, 384—character, 385
- Howitt's* 'History of the Supernatural,' reviewed, 27—modern repugnance to miracles, 28—character of the work, 30—his evidence of the universal presence of the supernatural, 30—modern spiritualism does not require a supernatural solution, 32—the Epworth disturbances, 34—the supernatural and the miraculous, 35—value of evidence, 38—the Christian miracles, 39—claims of Spiritualism, 43—contemptible character of the new revelations, 45—phenomena attending Mr. Home, 47—Swedenborg and Böhmé, 49—force of magnetism, 49—quality of evidence, 52—facts of Spiritualism not supernatural, 53—reality of unseen beings, 54—the prophets all 'mediums,' 56—Spiritualism auxiliary to scepticism, 59—apparitions, 61—witchcraft, 64—has Satan power to disturb the order of nature? 66—results of the inquiry, 68
- 'Hugo,' Victor, raconté par un Témoin de sa Vie,' reviewed, 163
- Hume's* notion of miracles, 493—refuted by Dr. Wardlaw, 495
- Imagination*, a singular effect of, 69
- 'Intellectual Observer,' noticed, 543
- Janet's* 'Philosophie du Bonheur,' reviewed, 171
- Jebb*, Sir J., strictures on the large power of, in prisons, 280, 289
- Jones*, Sir W., 'Christianity and Common Sense,' noticed, 526
- Jukes's* 'Types of Genesis,' noticed, 527
- Jurisdiction* in Colonial Churches, case of the Rev. W. Long and the bishop of Cape Town, 189—High-Churchism of the bishop, 189—the colonial synod, 191—Mr. Long's recusancy, 192—decision of Privy Council, 194—case of Dr. Warren, 195—the Free-Church question, 197—French Protestant Church in St. Martin's-le-Grand, 199—Non-conformist Churches, 201—colonial Church constitutions, 202—the Church in Victoria, 205—Bishop Colenso, 207
- Kingsley's* 'Gospel of the Pentateuch,' noticed, 540
- Labourers*, agricultural, of England, state of, 552
- Lamartine's* 'Fior d'Aliza,' reviewed, 177
- '*La Pologne depuis le Partage*,' reviewed, 71
- Lelewel's* 'History of Lithuania and Ruthenia,' reviewed, 71
- '*Lettres du Révérend Père Lacordaire*,' reviewed, 182
- Lewis*, Dr. W., medical statistics of the Post Office by, 236
- '*Life in Heaven*,' reviewed, 328
- Literature*, foreign, remarks on, 162
- Macleod's* 'Earnest Student,' noticed, 539
- McNicoll's*, Dr., 'Dictionary of Natural History Terms,' noticed, 548
- Manchester Church Congress*, 300—power of the Church of England, 301—the parochial system, 302—deficiency of church provision, 303—supply of clergy, 305—patronage, 306—revival of the Liturgy, 308—the Burial Service, 308—training of the clergy, 311—theological colleges and the universities, 313—the pulpit and the pastorate, 314—clerical discipline, 316—deaconesses,

- 319—school teachers, 320—church meetings, 320—Parliament, 321—districts, 322—legal aspect of Church extension, 324—'free and open church,' 325—summary, 327
- Martin's* 'Taranaki Question,' reviewed, 437
- Mayne*, Sir R., on prison discipline, 276, 280, 281, 291
- '*Meet for Heaven*,' reviewed, 328
- Mexico*, characteristics of the country, 387—physical geography, 388—legend of the Hungry Fox, 391—Hernando Cortez and the siege of Mexico, 392—the country under viceroys, 395—intrigues of the Audiencia, 396—sufferings of the Indians, 399—outbreak of the Revolution, 401—adventures of Guadalupe Victoria, 402—Santa Anna, 404—social condition of the country, 405—street cries, 406—street costumes, 407—politeness, 408—servants, 409—education, 410—the leperos, 411—travelling, 412—country life, 413—fauna and flora, 414—mines, 417—superstition, 417—future prospects, 418
- '*Mexico: the Country, History, and People*,' reviewed, 387
- '*Mill's* 'System of Logic,' reviewed, 420
- Miller*, Hugh, a geological theory of, 387
- Miracles*, contrasted with Spiritualism, 39—nature of', 487, *et seq.*
- Murphy's* 'Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis,' noticed, 527
- '*Mystery of Money* explained,' noticed, 531
- '*Newcastle Daily Chronicle*,' noticed, 554
- New Zealand*, the latest from, 437—recapitulation, 438—warlike operations in 1860, 441—Sir G. Grey gives up the Waitara block, 443—opinion of Colonel Carey and Archdeacon Paul, 443; of Archdeacon Hadfield, 444; of Sir W. Martin, 445—the new outbreak, 446—the Tataraimaka 'murders,' 447—the scene shifts to Waikato Land, 448—Sir G. Grey's edict about land, 450—present position, 451—progress of civilisation, 453—tenure of land, 456—fresh news, 456
- '*Ninth Report of the Postmaster General*,' reviewed, 209
- Norton's* 'Pentateuch,' noticed, 530
- Odgers'* 'Mystery of Being,' noticed, 533
- Paley*, cited on the resurrection, 39
- '*Papers*' and 'Further Papers relative to the recent Disturbances in New Zealand,' reviewed, 437
- Paul's* 'New Zealand,' reviewed, 437
- Peel*, the late Sir R., letter of, to Hood, 104
- Penal servitude*, appointment of a Commission of inquiry, 271—relaxation in the Act of 1853, 272—penal servitude as it now is, 274—diet, 275—rights and restraints, 276—the reformatory element, 277—low sense of right in punishment, 279—prison life, 281—the deterrent principle forgotten, 283—the ticket of leave, 285—need for reform in legislation and prison discipline, 286—classification of prisoners, 288—removal of indulgences, 290—the Irish system, 293—the Commissioners' suggestions, 294—memorandum of the Lord Chief Justice, 296—the incorrigibles, 298
- Philip*, Dr., quoted, on witchcraft, 28
- Poland*, 'the situation' in, 71—Treaty of Vienna, 71—the Treaty gradually nullified, 73—why Poland is socially in a backward state, 75—failure of the Reformation, 76—Count Zamoyaki, 77—Wielopolski, 79—the question of race, 80—Russia's claims to the Polish provinces as *re-conquests* examined, 80—Poland ruined by her efforts against the Turks, 84—medieval Russia worse than medieval Poland, 86—the morality of the question, 89
- Porochine's* 'Nationalité contestée,' reviewed, 71
- Prescott's* 'History of the Conquest of Mexico,' reviewed, 387
- Prenost-Paradol's* 'Elizabeth et Henri IV.,' reviewed, 178
- Prisoners'* Aid Society, labours of, 293
- Railway* travelling, influence of, on health, 237
- Renan's* Life of Jesus, reviewed, 457—the religious revival, 458—historical criticism, 461—Comte's hierarchies of sciences, 463—positivism and the Hegelian school, 464—M. Renan a positivist, 467; and a pantheist, 468—his Catholic education, 471—his qualifications, 473—analysis of the book, 475—history of Jesus, 475—nature of miracles, 487—science has no power to discredit miracles, 490—power of testimony to accredit miracles, 493—the natural and the moral world, 497—fallacious conception of the Deity, 499—material and spiritual order, 501—necessary conditions of evidence, 505—relative value of scientific evidence, 507—the Semitic theory, 509
- '*Report of the Commissioners on Transportation and Penal Servitude*,' reviewed, 272
- '*Report of the Manchester Church Congress*,' reviewed, 300
- '*Report of the Meeting of the British Association*,' noticed, 544
- Resurrection of Christ*, considered, 39

- Rigg's* 'Modern Anglican Theology,' strictures on Mr. Farrar's note on, 155
- Rigg's*, Rev. C. W., 'Digest of the Laws and Regulations of the Australasian Wesleyan Connexion,' noticed, 549
- Robinson's* 'Mexico,' quoted, 402
- Rogers*' 'Life and Character of John Howe,' reviewed, 355
- Ruxton's* 'Adventures in Mexico,' reviewed, 387
- Sainte-Beuve's* 'Nouveaux Lundis,' reviewed, 181
- Saisset's* 'his 'Essay on Religious Philosophy,' quoted, 459, 467—noticed, 514
- Sand's*, George, 'Antonia,' reviewed, 178
- Scandinavia*, spiritualism in, 31
- Scepticism*, many phases of, 5
- Scherer's* 'Etudes critiques sur la Littérature contemporaine,' noticed, 533
- Scientific nomenclature and terminology*, 420—popular names, 421—classification, 422—microscopical science, 424—want of a scientific vocabulary, 425—systematic nomenclature, 427—scientific caprices, 429—terminology, 430—scientific investigation, 431—botanical terminology, 433—formation of terms, 435
- 'Second Year of "One of England's little Wars,"' reviewed, 437
- 'Sequel to "One of England's little Wars,"' reviewed, 437
- Sharp's* 'Egyptian Mythology and Egyptian Christianity,' noticed, 518
- Shrewsbury's* 'Notes on Ezekiel,' noticed, 529
- Sibbes'* 'Complete Works,' noticed, 528
- Sinai Bible*, Dr. Tischendorf's researches, 239—discovery of the MS., 240; of which he obtains the loan, 242—transcription at Cairo, 243—leaves Egypt with the MS., 244—the MS. described, 245—corrections of the original, 248—mutilations, 249—preparations for publishing, 250—plan of publication, 251—the facsimile, 252—edition of the New Testament, 254—age of the Codex, 256—character of the text, 259—origin and relations of the text, 263—correspondence with older uncials and versions, 263—unique readings, 265—ancient and modern texts, 266—Tischendorf assailed and defended, 269
- Smith's* 'Power of the Tongue,' noticed, 529
- Steward's* 'Mediatorial Sovereignty,' noticed, 511
- Strauss*, his 'Life of Jesus' compared with that of M. Renan, 457, 470
- Sveinborg*, reveries of, 49
- Taylor*, Isaac, and the Epworth disturbances, 35
- Taylor's*, W., 'Californian Life,' noticed, 530—'Model Preacher,' noticed, 531
- 'Times,' quoted, 421, 449
- Tischendorf's* 'Notitia Editionis Codicis Bibliorum Sinaitici Auspiciis Imperatoris Alexandri II. susceptæ,' 'Bibliorum Codex Sinaiticus Petropolitanus,' 'Aus dem heiligen Lande,' 'Novum Testamentum Sinaiticum,' and 'Anfechtungen der Sinai-Bibel,' reviewed, 238
- Troubetzkoi's* 'Russie Rouge,' reviewed, 71
- Valentines*, number passed through the post in 1862, 217
- Wardlaw*, Dr., his refutation of Hume's notion of miracles, 495
- Watson*, R., quoted, on apparitions, 62
- Wesley*, a believer in witchcraft, 28
- Whewell's* 'Novum Organum Renovatum,' reviewed, 420
- Wicks'* 'Moses, or the Zulu?' noticed, 526
- William III.*, notices of, 378, 379
- Williams'* 'First Week of Time,' noticed, 539
- Wilton's* 'The Negeb,' noticed, 538
- Witchcraft*, past and present views of, 27—fear a prevailing element of belief in, 64
- 'Works of John Howe,' reviewed, 355
- Zoroaster*, exalted powers ascribed to, 85
- Zachokke*, Life and Works of, reviewed, 1—characteristics, 1, 26—autobiography, 3—education, 4—early wanderings, 6—studies at Frankfurt, 8—in Switzerland and Germany, 11—becomes a schoolmaster, 12—publishes 'The Swiss Messenger,' 13—his private life, 14—his 'Hours of Devotion,' 15—views of death, 17—training of his sons, 18—enjoyment of life, 19—repugnance to dogma, 21—doctrinal errors, 22—his 'Historical Survey of the Spread of Christianity,' 26

